

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XIII.—No. 49.

JANUARY, 1937.

LONDON THOW ART THE FLOWRE OF CYTES ALL

BY CURT F. BÜHLER

FOUR manuscripts of the poem *London thow art the Flowre of Cytes all* are extant, of which two are in the British Museum (MSS. Vitellius A. XVI and Lansdowne 762), one in the library of Balliol College, Oxford, and another in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York. The Morgan manuscript is the only one of these that has not been previously printed.¹

In MS. Vitellius A. XVI, "a chronicle of England containing the remarkable passages of what happened; together with the mayors and sheriffs of London, from A° 1215 to A° 1509,"² the poem *To London* is quoted (on f. 200) with a statement to the effect that it was presented at a dinner given by the Lord Mayor in Christmas Week, 1501. The occasion was a formal reception in honour of the Scottish mission sent to arrange the marriage (tentatively planned some years before by James IV and Richard Foxe, Bishop of Durham) between James and Margaret Tudor, when "sittyng at dyner

¹ MS. Vitellius A. XVI was used for the text of this poem in the editions of Dunbar's *Works* by J. Schipper, J. Small, and W. M. Mackenzie. (For editions, see below.) The text of Lansdowne 762 was printed by T. Wright and J. O. Halliwell in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, London, 1841, vol. i., pp. 205-7. The contents of the Balliol MS. were printed by Dr. Roman Dyboski in *Songs, Carols, etc. from Richard Hill's Balliol MS.*, E.E.T.S., 1907. At the end of the poem in the Balliol MS. is the note "Explicit þe treatise of London made at Mr. Shaa table whan he was mayre" and in the table (f. 4^v): "A litill balet made by London, made at Mr. Shawes table by a Skote." (John Shaa, goldsmith, was Lord Mayor of London in 1501). The texts of the Balliol and Lansdowne MSS. correspond closely to that in the Cotton manuscript.

² *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Cottonian Library*, London, 1802, p. 381.

ane of the said Scottis giving attendance upon a Bishop ambassador, the which was reputed to be a Protonotary of Scotland and the servant of the Ld. Bishop, made this Balade."¹

The Morgan manuscript of this poem is an important independent authority which was not consulted when the previous editions of this "balade" were prepared. The leaves on which the poem is found were originally bound in a copy of Caxton's *Cordiale* (finished March 24, 1479) formerly in the library of the Earl of Ashburnham. As the hand-writing appears to be of the first decade of the sixteenth century and the binding is certainly earlier, indeed it is, in all probability, one of the few books still extant which were bound in, or for, Caxton's printing-house,² we may assume that the Morgan manuscript represents an almost contemporary transcript. The Cotton manuscript, as we have seen, contains a list of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London to 1509, so that it is not unlikely that the Morgan text antedates that in Vitellius A. XVI. The poem in the Morgan MS. is preceded by the note:

"A balad mayde at London when my Lorde Prince Arthur was wed, by a Skotte hauyng muche money of dyuerse lordes for hys Indytyng."

The marriage referred to is that of Prince Arthur (eldest son of Henry VII) and Katherine of Aragon, which took place on November 14, 1501. The celebrations which preceded and followed the wedding were, of course, worthy of the international importance of this union, and there can be little doubt that the inevitable "ballads" were presented by the Court poets and visiting literateurs. John Stow, although not an eye-witness, describes the wedding in a most detailed manner.

The 9 of Nouember prince Arthur with a goodly companie came through Fleetstreet of London to S. Paules, and so to the wardrobe by the Blacke friers, and there was lodged. And the same day came the Lady Katherine Princesse vnto Lambeth, where she with her ladies was lodged, in the archbishops Inne of Canterbury: & upon the Friday next following about two of the clock at afternoone, the said lady princes accompanied with many lords & Ladies, in most sumptuous manner appparelled, came riding from Lambeth into Southwarke & so to London bridge, where was ordeined a costlie pageant of S. Katherine and S. Vrsula, with many virgins: from thence shee rode to Grace streete, where was ordeined a

¹ Quoted by Dr. W. Mackay Mackenzie, *The Poems of William Dunbar*, Edinburgh, 1932, p. 240.

² See the *Catalogue of Manuscripts and Early Printed Books from the Libraries of William Morris, Richard Bennett, Bertram Fourth Earl of Ashburnham and other Sources now forming portion of the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*, London, 1907, vol. iii., p. 167.

second pageant, from thence to the conduct in Cornehill, where was another pageant. The great conduct in cheape ran with Gascoine wine, and was furnished with musick. Against Soperlane end was the fourth pageant. At the standard in cheape was ordeined the fift pageant. At Pauls gate was the 6 pageant : by which the princesse rode through Pauls Churchyard vnto the bishop of Londons palace, where she and her people were lodged.

Now within the church of S. Paul, to wit, from the west gate of it vnto the vppermost greese or step at the going in of the quier, was made a pace of timber and boords to go vpon, from the sayd west doore vnto the forenamed greese, of the height of 6 foote from the ground, or more : & foreanent the place where the commissaries court is kept within the said church, was ordeined a standing, like vnto a mountaine, with steps on euery side, which was couered ouer with red wusted, & in likewise was all the railes : against which mountaine vpon the northside, within the foresaid place of the commissaries court was ordeyned a standing for the king, and such other as liked him to haue : and on the south side almost, for against the kings standing was ordeined a scaffold, whereupon stoode the Maior and his brethren.

Then vpon the 14 of Nouember being Sunday, vpon the aboue named mountaine, was prince Arthur about the age of 15 yeeres, and the lady Katherine about the age of 18 yeeres, both clad in white sattine, married by the archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by 19 Bishops and abbots mitred. And the K. the Queene, the kings mother, stood in the place aforenamed where they hearde & beheld the solemnization which being finished, the said archbyshop & Bishops tooke their way from the mountaine, vpon the saide pace couered vnder foote with blew rey-cloth vnto the quier, & so to the high altar, whom followed the spouse and spouses, the lady Cicile sister to the Q. bearing her traine, after her followed 100 ladies & gentlewomen, in right costly apparell, then the Maior in a gowne of crimson veluet, and his brethren in scarlet, with the sword born before the maior, & sate in the quier the masse while, the archb[ishop] of Yorke sate in the deanes place, & offred as chiefe, and after him the duke of Buckingham etc. Woonderfull it was to behold the riches of apparel worne that day, with the poisant chaines of gold : of which, two were specially noted, to wit, sir T. Brandon knight, master of the kings horse, which that day wore a chain valued at 1400 pound : and the other W. de Riuers esquire, master of the king haukes, whose chaine was valued at a thousand pound : many mo were of 200, 300 and so forth, these were not noted for length, but for the greatnesse of the links. Also the Duke of Buckingham wore a gowne wrought of Needle worke and set vpon cloth of tissue, furred with sables, the which Gowne was valued at 1500. l. & sir Nicholas Vause knight wore a gown of purple veluet, pight with peeces of gold so thicke & massie, that it was valued in golde, besides the silke and fur, a thousand pounce : which chaines and garments were valued by goldsmithes of best skill, and them that wrought them. The masse being finished, the princesse was led by Henry duke of Yorke, and a Legate of Spain, by the foresaid pace into the palace, going before her

men of honor, to the number of 160 with gentlemen and other. There came vnto the Maior, sir Richard Crofts steward of the Princes house, which brought him & his brethren the aldermen into the great hall, and at a table vpon the west side of the hall, caused them to bee set to dinner, where honorable were they serued with 12 dishes to a messe at the first course, 15 the second course, and 18 dishes the third course. In this hall was a cupboord of fiue stages height, being triangled, the which was set with plate valued 1200 l. the which was neuer moooued at that day : and in the vtter chamber where the princesse dined, was a cupboord of gold plate, garnished with stone and pearle, valued aboue 20000 pound. The tuesday following the king & queene being all this season at Bainards castle, came vnto Powles, and heard there masse and then accompanied with many nobles went into the palace, and there dined with the princesse. This day sir Nicholas Vause warc a coller of Esses which weied, as the goldsmithes that made it reported 800 pounce of nobles : And the same day at afternoon, the said princes were conueied with many Lords and Ladies vnto Powles wharffe, where the said estates tooke their barges, & were rowed to Westminster, vpon whom the Maior attended, with the Aldermen & fellowships in barges, garnished with banners and other deuises, musick, etc. Thus much for that marriage.¹

The general description of London in the poem very closely resembles Stow's account of the wedding celebrations ; on the other hand, if we are to believe that the poem was written at that time, it is indeed strange that there is no reference to the wedding anywhere in the " balad."

The same is true, though to a lesser degree, if we consider the manuscript attribution in the Cotton MS. The poem is appropriate enough for a Lord Mayor's banquet in its eulogies of the " city " and its Mayor, but it is strange that the reason for which these " Scottis " came to London is not mentioned. " Conversations " were still going on and the wedding " by proxie " did not take place till " the day of the conuersion of S. Paule," so that the poet may have considered it best not to refer to the " mission " at all. The marriage conversations could hardly, however, be said to have been secret, as they had been going on for upwards of three years. It is scarcely probable that the real purpose of Bishop Blackader's visit was unknown to the citizens of London, although official circles may not have discussed it publicly. The plenipotentiaries actually left Scotland early in October, so that they may have been in London for a month before the poem *To London* was written. In view of

¹ *The Annales or Generall Chronicle of England*, London, Thomas Adams, 1615, pp. 483 and 484. See also Edward Halle's, *The Union of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre and Yorke*.

the circumstances, some delicate tribute to Margaret, however much it might have been veiled, would, no doubt, not only have been welcomed but expected.

If, and the evidence of the manuscripts cannot very well be completely ignored, we consider these attributions, it is evident that the poem was composed in the winter of 1501/2 by a "Skotte" who was at that time in London. Whether or not the poem can be attributed to Dunbar is doubtful. It appears that the main reason for ascribing the poem to him is based on the rather circumstantial evidence that Dunbar was the only distinguished Scottish poet who was there at the time the poem was written. Professor Schipper¹ says that "the poem bears all the characteristics of Dunbar's style and metre etc.," while Mackenzie (p. 241) maintains that "the proposition that no one but Dunbar *could* have produced this poem is not at all self-evident, since it is clear that other clerkly people of the time were capable of turning out quite tolerable verses." The poem is included, however, in the critical editions of Dunbar's works and is ascribed to him without hesitation by *The Cambridge History of English Literature* and the *Oxford Book of English Verse*.

It has not been definitely established that Dunbar was a member of Bishop Blackader's mission. In the *Scottish Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer*, there is a record of the payment of £5 to Master William Dunbar (the "Master" implies that Dunbar was a Magister Artium) on December 20th, 1501, "quhilk wes payit to him eftir he com furth of England."² This presumably could not have been entered into the *Accounts* or have been paid to Dunbar, if he was in England at that time. Dr. Mackenzie, however, notes this interesting fact (p. 240):

But an entry in the *Accounts* for 3rd January, 1501/2, records a payment to Lyon Herald "quhen he cum furth of Ingland," yet "Lyon King of Armes" is recorded among those who received gifts from King Henry on the Thursday after the conclusion of the treaty of marriage on 25th January, 1502. It would seem, then, that the inference as to Dunbar's return suggested by the entry in the *Treasurer's Accounts* does not necessarily follow.

¹ J. Schipper, "Poems of William Dunbar" in *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Classe*, Wien, 1892-3, (vol. 40, p. 87, and vol. 42, p. 86). See also J. Small, *The Poems of William Dunbar*, Scottish Text Society, 1893.

² Concerning this entry, Dr. Mackenzie says: "This is plainly the amount of pension due to him at the previous Martinmas, and the entry would suggest that this was the later date of payment and that Dunbar by that time was therefore back in Scotland, in which case he could not have been at the Lord Mayor's dinner or been the writer of the poem."

According to the Morgan manuscript, however, the celebration at which the poem was presented was the wedding of Prince Arthur and Katherine of Aragon on November 14, so that if Dunbar really composed the "balad" for this occasion he might easily have been back in Scotland by December 20. Apart from the reference in the Cotton manuscript, there is no evidence that Dunbar was a member of the Scottish mission; although it is clear, from the *Accounts*, that he had been in England prior to December 20, 1501. It has been supposed that Dunbar was occasionally entrusted with diplomatic missions; did he attend the royal wedding on behalf of King James? The Morgan manuscript does not set at rest these perplexing problems, but it does show how Dunbar might have written the ballad for an important celebration in London¹ and yet have been in Scotland on December 20 to receive his pension.

Dr. Mackenzie notes two further records: "On 31st December, 1501, there is a payment on behalf of Henry VII of £6 13s. 4d. 'to the Rhymer of Scotland in reward,' repeated on 7th January, 1502, as 'to a Rhymer of Scotland.'" If the "Rhymer of Scotland" was Dunbar, the question that arises is why Henry VII authorized these payments. Among the extant poems of Dunbar, there are only two which connect the Scottish poet with Henry VII; the ballad *To London* and *The Thrissil and the Rois*. In the Morgan Manuscript, we are expressly told that the poet had "much money of dyverse Lordes for hys Indytyng." Was Henry VII one of these Lords? But we can scarcely believe that King Henry patronized Dunbar for a poem presented at the wedding of the Prince of Wales in which neither the wedding nor the royal reception is mentioned. On the other hand, if the ballad was presented at the Lord Mayor's dinner and as it is little more than a eulogy of the "city" and its Mayor, it is not quite clear why the notoriously close-fisted Henry made Dunbar such comparatively handsome grants. The King presented to the "Scottish Rhymer" more than thirteen pounds, whereas the annual pension paid to Dunbar at this time amounted to only twenty pounds *per annum*. That Dunbar received these sums for writing *The Thrissil and the Rois* is possible, but there is no direct evidence for this. In that case, we must assume that the

¹ Obviously one of the attributions is wrong. The two events took place little more than a month apart and were of a very similar nature, so that this may explain the two MSS. notes. As the gloss in the Morgan MS. speaks of "my lorde Prince Arthur" and not of "my Late Lorde," are we to suppose that the transcript was written before Arthur's death on April 2nd, 1502? In that case, the gloss in the Morgan MS. would probably be correct.

money represented an advance payment, which in a time when even a promised subsidy was paid late and reluctantly (if at all), is unusual. The date of this poem is confusing in any case; it was written, ostensibly, to commemorate the marriage of James IV and Princess Margaret Tudor, but the last two lines bear the date May 9.

And thus I wret, as ye haif hard to forrow,
Off lusty May upone the nynt morrow.

The marriage treaty was concluded on January 24, 1502, and on January 25, 1503, as we have seen, the espousal with the Earl of Bothwell as proxy took place. Margaret did not leave Richmond till June 27, arriving in Scotland towards the end of July (Henry VII had, indeed, stipulated that Margaret was to remain in England till September 1, 1503, but he yielded to James's request that she come earlier); the actual wedding was celebrated on August 8 at Holyrood. In view of these facts, why did Dunbar write *The Thrissil* on May 9? Possibly the answer may be found in the poem itself; May says to the poet:

Thow did promyt, in Mayis lusty quhyle,
For to discryve the Ros of most plesance.

The poem, although that may be expected in view of the special circumstances, is more friendly towards England than most of Dunbar's poems. Did Dunbar promise Henry VII that he would write some such poem and do the grants of December 31, 1501, and of January 7, 1502, represent Henry's payment for *The Thrissil*?

In both the Morgan and the Cotton MSS., *To London* is definitely ascribed to a Scottish poet, but the poem in the Morgan manuscript is no more Scottish than in Vitellius A. XVI. The Southern verb terminations for the present indicative predominate; *ben* (*be*) and *arte* for Sc. *ar* and *es*, the present participle in *-yng*, *churchys* (*c > ch*, not *k*), *etc.*, are all Southern characteristics. Northern forms occur in: (1) the present indicative plural is *-s* (Stanza VI); (2) *mast* (*mast* is the normal form in the North and Scotland, *mæst > mast*); (3) *kelles* ("Kell. A Northern form corresp. to M.E. *calle*, *caul*; the difference in vowel is not easy to account for"—N.E.D.); (4) *apon* (mostly Scottish); (5) *beryall* (a Scottish form—so Dunbar, *Gouldyn Targe*, l. 23 and Lyndesay, *Ane Satyre*, l. 132; but see the Southern form *byrall* in Stanza IV); (6) *hore* (generally spelt *ar* in Scottish; it could have been pronounced with a decided *o* here, as it rhymes with *compare*), *etc.* As in most late MSS. the *p* has lost almost entirely its original character and is

written like a *y*; the *o* is made with two strokes of the pen, so that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish it from an *a*. (In Stanza II, *flode* may be *flade*—a form not recorded by the *N.E.D.*—from the verb *flede* via *flæde* > *flade*?).

A balad mayde at London when my lorde Prince Arthur was wed,
by a Skotte hauyng muche money of dyuerse lordes for hys Indytyng.

I

London, thow arte of townes chefe of dygnyte,
And sowerent of all cytes, semlyste in syght,
Of hye renowne, ryches, and eke of ryalte;
Of lordes, barons, & many goodly knythe;
Of maste delectable lusty & ladys bryghte;
Of famos prelates in habytes clerly alle;
Of merchandes of svstans, & men of grete myght;
O London, thow arte the flowre of cytes alle.

II

Now may thow reioy, thow lusty Troy meyyte;
Cyte þat som tyme clepyd was newe Troy;
In alle erthe imperialle as þou standythe;
Byralle of cytes, of plesure and joye,
A rychere restoryd vnder Crysten roye;
flore manly powere, with craftes naturalle,
flore there ware no feyerere sythe the flode of Noye;
London, thu art the flour of cytes alle.

III

Gemme of alle joy, jasper of jocundite,
Maste myghty carbuncle of vert(u)es & valour;
(S)tronge Troy in vigore & strenuyte;
Of rialle cites rose & gerafloure;
Emperas of cytes, exalte to honour;
In bewte beryng the crowne imperyalle;
Swete paradyse precellyng in plesure;
London, thow art the flowre of cytes alle.

IV

A-bowe alle reuerse, thy reuer hathe renowne,
Whos beryalle stremys, plesand & preclere,
Vnder thy lusty walles contynualy rynes a-downe;
Where many a swanne dothe swym with wyngges feyre;
Where many a barge dothe sayle & rowe with hore;
Where many a shyppe dothe reste with toppe ryalle.
O towne of townes, not to compare:
London, þou art the flowre of cytes all.

V

A-pon thy lusty brygge of pyllors whyte
 Bene merchandes fulle ryalle to be-hold ;
 A-pon the stretes gothe many a semly knythe
 In welvet gowns & chenys of gold.
 By Julius Cesare the towne foundy^t of hold
 May be the hows of Mars victoryalle,
 Whos arttelery *with* tong may not be told :
 London, thow art (the flowre of cytes alle).

VI

Strong bene the wallys *pat* a-bowte the stondes ;
 Wyse *ben* the peple *pat* in the dwellys ;
 Freshe ys the ryvere *with* hys lusty stremys ;
 Blythe be the churchys, well sowndyng *with* belles ;
 Ryche be the merchaundes in substance *pat* excelles ;
 Feyre be there wyves, ryght luf-sorn, *gentyl* & smalle ;
 Clere be the *virgyns*, lusty vnder kelles :
 London, *pou* art (the flowre of cytes alle).

VII

The famos mayre, by princely gouernance,
 With swerde of justyce he rewlythe *prudently*.
 No lord of Parys, Venys, or Florance
 In dignite ore honour gothe hym nye.
 He ys exsamplere, lode-stere, and guye,
 Princepall & rose oryginalle,
 A-bow alle meyres ys moste wurthy :
 London, *pou* art the flowre of cytes alle.

Stanza I, l. 3 : eke of] *so by interlinear correction in MS.*

Stanza II, l. 7 : ware] were? MS.

Stanza III, l. 2 : *vert(u)es*] *vertes* MS.

l. 3 : (S)tronge] Tronge MS.

Stanza, IV, l. 3 : *contynualy*] *so by correction from contynuly*

l. 3 : a-downe] *so by correction from downe*

l. 6 : dothe reste] *so by correction from restes*

l. 7 : to compare] *the to added interlinearly in MS.*

Stanza V, l. 3 : *semly*] *semly man with man crossed out in MS.*

l. 5 : towne] towre?

l. 8 : MS. *reads* London thow art ut supra ; *so also in*

Stanza VI, l. 8

Stanza VI, l. 2 : dwellys] *so by correction from dwellythe*

Stanza VII, l. 5 : lode-stere] *so by correction from stere*.¹

¹ [No attempt has been made by Dr. Bühler to compare the Pierpont Morgan text with that of other MSS., but it is evident that the relationship of the texts is not a simple matter, and requires investigation. Some of the readings of the Morgan MS. may perhaps be due to misreadings on the part of the scribe, but in others the divergence from the accepted text is so great that such an explanation is out of the question.—Ed. R.E.S.]

THE CIVET-CATS OF NEWINGTON GREEN: NEW LIGHT ON DEFOE

BY THEODORE F. M. NEWTON

"HE has run through the three degrees of Comparison, *Pos.* as a *Hosier*; *Compar.* as a *Civet-Cat Merchant*; and *Super.* as a *Pantile Merchant*," charged a well-informed contemporary pamphlet about the business failures of Daniel Defoe.¹ The passage has been a puzzler for all biographers of the great romancer. The reference to his activities as a hosier is clear enough, though hardly accurate, and the term "Pantile merchant" holds no mystery, for of all Daniel's early business ventures, the only one from which he derived any substantial, if short-lived, income, seems to have been his brick and tile works at Tilbury. But the phrase "Civet-Cat Merchant" has defied solution to this day, and has led only to amusing conjecture by chroniclers of Defoe's activities. Some of those who know of the pungent aroma which surrounds the civet-cat have seen in the term merely the well-grounded insinuation that Daniel's business dealings were not always in good odour. Some have felt that he dealt in furs; others that he imported drugs from Holland. One biographer has ingeniously painted a word picture of the little animal hanging as a symbol before the hosier's shop in Cornhill, and is so firm in his conviction that he heads one subsection of his account, "At the Sign of the Civet Cat"!

Scholars have been the more zealous to find the true explanation of the perplexing reference, since, until recently, the known facts about the early life of the great journalist have been few and isolated. As an author, his was a late blossoming. By his thirty-fifth year he had published only a half-dozen unimportant pieces of over three hundred which ultimately came from his pen. The years of his youth and early manhood were spent in other pursuits, and his taciturnity about the period has left his biographers a heritage of little knowledge and great curiosity. Through the recent researches of Paul Dottin, James Sutherland, and others, however,

¹ *Observations on the Bankrupts' Bill*, 1706.

Daniel Foe, merchant, of Cornhill, London, has begun to emerge from the mists of obscurity to settle some of the vexing problems which have faced students of his later years.

As befitted a shopkeeper's son, he had taken an early plunge into the London business world, and, despite the later gibes of his enemies, he was much more than a local seller of stockings. By the time of the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688, he had lived in Spain and Portugal, buying wines and liquors to ship to England, and had journeyed as a commission merchant over a considerable portion of England and the Continent. In the years before his financial failure, he owned ships and insured those of others. He imported tobacco, firewood, snuff, wines, and liquors on his own account, and shipped merchandise to Ireland and North America. He had agents across the Atlantic in Boston, New York, and Maryland. As a rising member of a rising class, he was quick to gain a place of influence in the councils of his kind.

Temporary successes and the general fever of speculation which infected the early years of William's reign, however, began to lead him more and more away from sound business principles and into hazardous investment. It was the golden age of the "projector"—the wildcat promoter of a later day—and almost every new invention sired an unsound stock-floating scheme. Letting ambition run away with good judgment, Defoe embarked upon ventures of mushroom growth and substantiality. When, at the declaration of war with France, French privateers began preying on English trading ships, the combination of inflation at home and disaster at sea relentlessly thinned the ranks of London's merchant aristocracy, and Daniel Defoe was one of the first to see his house of dreams come crashing about his ears.

He had taken to wife Mary Tuffley, daughter of a wealthy wine-cooper, and her dowry of £3,700 was soon swallowed up in the financial morass into which her husband had fallen. As Defoe had invested in the grand manner, in the same way did he collapse. By 1692, he had reaped the price of folly and had failed for £17,000. With unsuspecting consideration for later biographers of their quarry, Daniel's creditors began to sue. Harried and hunted, he fought desperately to avoid the horrors of a debtors' jail, and *in extremis* had resort to practices which were more ingenious than straightforward, which brought neither immediate financial relief nor subsequent peace of mind.

One of the oddest and least creditable incidents of that year of nightmares in Defoe's life at once provides the solution of the obscure "civet-cat" reference and affords a curious little story whose ill-assorted principals are our luckless merchant, his outraged mother-in-law, and seventy live civet-cats. The tangled materials for the reconstruction of much of Defoe's early life have lain almost undisturbed in the records of the Courts of Chancery and King's Bench for almost two hundred and fifty years, and it is from this veritable maze of litigation that the complaint of Joan Tuffley of Islington, made to 'Their Majesties' Court of Chancery in the year 1693, is now summoned to tell a tale of widow's woe.¹

The Tuffley bill reveals that "on or about the one and twentieth day of Aprill in the yeare of our Lord one thousand six hundred ninety two, . . . one Daniell ffoe of London Merchant" had acquired some "seaventy Civett Catts," all very much alive. The disturbing question as to why the impoverished Daniel should feel the urge to buy this curious collection of livestock demands a word or two concerning the exact function of the civet cat in the cause of humanity. Common misconception has identified it with that less aristocratic member of the cat family, the North American skunk. But there is at least half a world of difference. The civet-cat is no closer than an African or Asiatic cousin of our least respected feline, and disports itself in great numbers in the wilds of Abyssinia. Although its occidental cousin is disliked and despised, the civet-cat is sought after, bargained for, and tended with loving care, for from a pouch under its bushy tail comes periodically a buttery oil which forms the base of the well-known perfume, and each year in the land of Rasselas quantities of this noisome substance are packed in bullock horns and shipped to the perfumers of Europe and America.

Former ages knew well this paradox of sweetness and stench. English merchants of other centuries transported the beasts to Britain and reaped handsome profits, for an ounce of civet in Restoration times brought the surprising return of about £2. It had tickled the nostrils of Elizabethan days, and even in later years it was looked on as a cure-all for certain diseases of the head and brain, for fits and vapours, for bad hearing, barrenness, and depression of spirits!² One French chemist of Defoe's time states that it

¹ C7. 333/33.

² For references to civet as perfume, see *Much Ado about Nothing*, III. ii. *Pilgrim's Progress* (Oxford, 1926), p. 370; and Cowper's *Tirocinium*, ll. 829-30.

"is good for the Cholick in Infants, if applied to the Navel."¹ It is, then, hardly strange that there was a ready market for such an elixir; nor is it strange that, with that market in view, the hard-pressed Daniel should seek to provide balm for another type of ill by appropriating a suburban civet-farm.

Through the invaluable aid of my assistant, Mrs. F. K. Wilson, I have gained access to one bill and four answers pertaining to that purchase and its consequences, and from the stilted legal phraseology can be reconstructed an amusing tale of fraud. To be brief, Joan Tuffley complains in her bill "to the Right honorable S^r John Somers Knight Lord Keeper of the greate Seale of England" that she has been gulled of almost £600 and she doesn't quite know by whom. The unfortunate lady's perplexity is complete, but she names several leading candidates for the dishonour—her indigent son-in-law, Daniel Foe; John Barksdale, merchant; Samuel Stancliffe, hosier; John Blunt, scrivener; Sir Thomas Estcourt; and, finally, even the sheriffs of London.

It appears from the suit and its answers that, early in 1692, Daniel Foe learned that John Barksdale, who owned over three-score civet-cats and the quarters and equipment necessary to give them exacting care, had ordered a gentleman with the amazing name of Jacob Delafontayn Jan Zoon to put the cats up for sale. Defoe, who, as we know, was already thousands of pounds in debt, visited this civet house, which he probably knew from boyhood days at Newington. It was now "fitted & made convenient and proper only for the keeping & feeding" the cats, containing the animals themselves in "severall Coopes with Troughs and Cisterns to feed them in and stoves for keeping of ffires in the severall roomes for the preservacōn of the said Catts." In continuing, the documents reveal that Defoe contracted to buy the civet-cats, which Joan Tuffley numbers at seventy and Barksdale later at sixty-nine, for the sum of "eight hundred fifty and two pounds or thereabouts."

Mistress Tuffley maintained that this sum included rent of the house, and, at a purchase price of £12 a cat, one is tempted to suggest that house, servants, and all should have been thrown in for good measure. How wrong the poor lady was in most of her contentions will presently appear, but the complaint asserts her belief that her son-in-law paid Barksdale the price agreed on, and

¹ Pierre Pomet, *A Compleat History of Drugs* (London, 1712), ii. 242.

that Defoe, or Foe, as his name more correctly appears in all these documents,

did keepe and maintaine the said Catts from the said Month of Aprill aforesaid vntill about the fifteenth day of October then next following and now last past and received the proffitts arising by and from the said Catts to his the said daniell Foes owne proper vse and behoofe without any manner of Account to any person or persons whatsoever and was the absolute Owner and Proprietor thereof.

The suit of the bewildered widow hurries on to present the setting for another rococo sketch. Defoe had been formerly associated in business with an hosier named Samuel Stancliffe. The latter himself relates that he "for severall yeares past had an acquaintance and considerable dealings in the way of trade and merchandize and otherwise with Daniell Foe," and, as we might expect, that Defoe owed him money.¹ Although already heavily in his debt, Defoe approached him "on or about the One and Twentieth day of June" of the year 1692 (and the date should be noted) asking for a further loan of £400 in order to buy

a certain number of Civett Cats he was then as he told this Def^t about purchasing of John Barksdale . . . and would be of great benefit to him And this Def^t being unwilling the said Foe Should loose the advantage he proposed to get in buying the said Cats furnished the Said Foe with the said Summe of Four hundred pounds more for that purpose and beleives the same was applyed to the purchase of the said Cats the said Foe having often told this Def^t it was so applyed

Defoe's debt to Stancliffe had mounted to £1,500, and it was not long before the latter realized that, unless drastic steps were taken, he could whistle in vain for his money. He relates that

having often afterwards presst the said Daniell Foe to pay this Def^t all or some part of his said debt but being able to get none of it but perceiving the troubles that daily came upon the said Foe by reason of certain debts he had contracted and then owed to severall others

he determined to take legal means to salvage what part he could of the loans he had made. Accordingly, he obtained from the authorities a writ of seizure against Defoe's goods and chattels.

The next step in the bizarre little drama is probably already evident. One day in mid-October, 1692, the sheriffs of London, the wealthy Sir Thomas Lane and Sir Thomas Cooke, or their

¹ C9. 309/62.

agents, came riding out to Newington and in the name of His Majesty King William made formal seizure of seventy guiltless civet-cats.

Inventory and appraisal followed, and soon the cats were offered for public sale, the proceeds, of course, being destined for Stancliffe. The appraisal price of £439 7s. represented hardly more than half the price Defoe had originally contracted to pay. He hastened to his mother-in-law, who had helped him in business dealings before this time. Capacity for persuasion was native to Daniel, and he probably put up an eloquent plea for the salvaging of his livestock. At any rate, on October 17, Joan Tuffley gave the sheriffs their price, and from this day on the widow's servants

were in the . . . house to feed and looke after the said Catts and goods and soe continued in peaceable possession thereof vntil the seven and twentyeth day of March last past

during which time she "did expend and lay out in meate and other things necessary for keeping and preserveing the said Catts alive and for servants wages and otherwise the sūme of one hundred and fifty pounds."¹

On that day in March Defoe's indulgent mother-in-law awakened to a sad realization. Seizure had again reared its ugly head, and the servants of a certain Sir Thomas Estcourt had taken possession of the cat colony, making the startling claim that Sir Thomas had been the true owner of the cats and the house for the last seven months. Joan's indignant insistence that she possessed papers of sale from the sheriffs dating from the previous October was of little avail; Estcourt firmly asserted that not only were the civet-cats not Defoe's lawful property at the time of the sheriff's seizure in October, but that they *never* had legally belonged to her son-in-law.

It must have been a pretty kettle of fish for the Islington widow to stomach. If Sir Thomas, a reputable and wealthy merchant, had legal proof that he owned the cats, over four hundred pounds of her money had disappeared into thin air. If, as Estcourt claimed, Defoe had signed away all claim to possession of the cats in August of the previous year, she had been gulled by her own son-in-law, for he had persuaded her to turn over her money to the sheriffs. And either in ignorance or otherwise, Stancliffe and the sheriffs had been party to a fraud which had won over four

¹ C7. 333/33.

hundred pounds from her and converted it to the partial satisfaction of one of Defoe's debts. Only one thing was immediately and abundantly clear: some one should be made to return to her either her live-stock or her money.

In her recourse to the Court of Chancery, she charged "manifest fraud" on the parts of Defoe, Barksdale, and Estcourt, and, in an attempt to ferret out the truth, asked that all three be required to make answer to her charges. She had naturally been able to learn little from her son-in-law, and she demanded that the court make him relate all the details of his part of the affair, including the amount of profit made by him from the cats.

But she sought justice a little too late to catch her gay deceiver. Such indications as can be found suggest that the bird had already flown. Before a week had passed, the other defendants appeared and later made answer, but no Daniel came to judgment. Within nine days of the filing of her writ both the sheriff of London and the sheriff of Surrey had been given subpoenas for Defoe in an attempt to make him appear.¹

It is regrettable that we do not possess Defoe's legal defence against a mother-in-law's wrath; if one ever existed, the transcript of it remains undiscovered. His duplicity is fairly well established by corroborating facts in the other answers, and from those one can arrive at a fairly definite reconstruction of his double dealing.

Barksdale's answer throws light on the complex financial dealings which invest the case.² He states that on April 21, 1692, Defoe contracted to buy the civet-cats from him for the sum of £852 15s., that he paid only £200 down, that he was to pay £300 more within a month, and the remainder within six months. Barksdale, however, failed to receive any more money from Defoe than the first payment of £200. He did persuade Defoe to give notes for the £300 to some of Barksdale's own creditors and, upon this, Daniel was allowed use without ownership, the profits from the cats, and the services of two servants at the civet house. The notes which Defoe had given proved worthless and, accordingly, Barksdale firmly refused to give him legal possession of the cats. Nevertheless, Barksdale charges,

the said Daniell Foe discharged one of this Defendants said two Servants and sett locks on severall of the Doores . . . in the absence of this

¹ Decrees and Orders, B. Book, 1692, fol. 380.

² C7. 333/33.

Def^t and without this Def^s leave or knowledge whereupon this Def^t suspecting the said Daniell Foe his designe this Def^t ordered the said locks to be broken open

If Barksdale is truthful, another interesting sidelight on Defoe's chicanery becomes apparent. The document states that, at the time of the agreement to buy,

the said Daniell Foe informed this Defendant that he had a designe to engage his Brother in law Samuel Tuffley the said Complainants Sonne in the said affaire and desired this Defendant to give him a Bill of parcels [an invoice] of the said Catts which this Defendant accordingly did And this Defendant saith that afterwards the said Daniell Foe considered with himselfe as this Defendant doth beleive he did desire this Defendant to give him another Bill of parcels of the said Catts at an higher price than was exprest in the said first Bill of pcells which this Defendant accordingly did

Evidently the wily Daniel wished to convince his "in-laws" that the total purchase price was greater than that for which the actual agreement called.

Barksdale was heavily in debt early in 1692 to Sir Thomas Estcourt and others, and when Defoe failed to make anything but a down payment, he tried to transfer Defoe's liability to Estcourt as partial satisfaction for his own debts. But Estcourt would have none of it; he did not know Defoe and refused to accept the securities which Daniel tendered. Seeing no other way out, Barksdale accordingly deeded the cats to Estcourt and forced Defoe to sign away his claim. The terms of the deed stated that Defoe was to be obliged to take care of the cats for Estcourt until February 17, 1693. He had the profits of the cats for six months but, at the time of the sheriff's seizure, was nothing more than an employee of Estcourt's looking after the cats. Barksdale confesses that he knew an execution had been served on Defoe, but professed ignorance of what had been seized. The answers of Estcourt¹ and Blunt² substantiate the assertions of Barksdale in most particulars.

It will be remembered that the only sum which Defoe paid Barksdale was £200 on April 21, the time of purchase. Yet two months later he borrowed £400 from Stancliffe for the announced purpose of buying the civet-cats. Stancliffe had a right to think, as he asserts in his answer, that the cats really were Defoe's and seizure therefore permissible. In fact, a little before the attach-

¹ C7. 333/33.

² C9. 309/62.

ment, Defoe had told him that Barksdale "had often importuned him to Mortgage the said Cats but he had refused to doe so." After the seizure, Stancliffe relates, Joan Tuffley approached him to ask him to take £400 for the civet-cats, saying that she was

induced thereunto meerly for the good of the said Foe (who is her Son in Law) and of his family and that the profits arising should be for the supply of him the said Foe and his family and she would take noe benefit to herselfe by the purchase. . . . And the Comp^t did also then desire this Def^t to signify the same to the other Creditors of the said Foe (who were to meet in a short time to receive proposalls towards payment of their severall debts) and to urge it to them from her as an argument to induce them to a Compliance with the termes then to be offered to them

Defoe lost an active and benevolent ally when he brought fraud into the bosom of his family circle.

As to further narrative, the rest is silence. Joan Tuffley replied to the various answers of the defence in the following year, but the document cannot be found. Evidence of her disillusionment and discovery that she had no case against Estcourt can be found in her ultimate failure to proceed and the dismissal of her suit in February, 1696, when she paid to Estcourt the usual loser's penalty of seven nobles.¹

The picture of Daniel Defoe put together from ten thousand words of litigation of the year 1693 is hardly a very pleasant one. In the shadow of the debtors' prison, a fate in those days horrible to contemplate, he gambled for relief; and when he lost he turned to knavery. He had little hope in the first place of financing the Newington venture properly. He paid less than a quarter of the purchase price, gave worthless notes for part of the remainder, and had the amount of the invoice increased to fool his family. He borrowed money for the express purpose of buying the cats, used none of it to that end, and lied in saying that he had. After he had deeded the beasts to Estcourt, he falsified their status both to Stancliffe and to his mother-in-law. He worked the modern "Statue of Liberty" confidence game two centuries before its time, for he knowingly aided others in selling something which he knew was not theirs to sell. The proceeds of his fraud went towards payment of his personal debts, and the hapless victim was his own mother-in-law.

¹ Decrees and Orders, B. Book, 1695, fol. 403, February 19.

It has been the fashion amongst some scholars to ascribe any weaknesses in the character of Defoe the journalist to the embittering of unjust prosecution and the scribbler's pillory in 1703. But this narrative plucked from neglected files should have significance for the interpreters of Defoe in adding proof that flaws in his moral fibre were to be seen at least a decade earlier, when the debtors' prison loomed in front of him. The commercial morality of the age was far from high, and the fight to remain solvent often produced ethical neglect in unexpected places.

Sequels concern us little here. Daniel Defoe lived to father the world's greatest adventure story. Joan Tuffley, married again, welcomed her son-in-law back to her family circle.¹ Barksdale earned a minor place as a customs official of the port of London.² Samuel Stancliffe, two years later, departed from a thankless world heavily in debt, but with no apparent malice towards Defoe.³

And the captive cats of Newington Green? Litigation seems to have brought them neither affection nor security. I was amused to discover the germ of an epilogue in the columns of the first great journal of commerce, Houghton's *Collection of Letters for the Improvement of Husbandry and Trade*. Two years to the month from the time when the hard-pressed Defoe had sought to become a cat-farmer, appeared the following notice:

At the Civet House in Newington Green are Threescore Civet Cats, with a considerable quantity of Civet to be sold: I can give an account of the prices of each.

By that time "restless" Daniel was "projecting" elsewhere.

¹ If a statement in "A Character of Daniel DeFoe," Br. Mus. Add. MS. 28094, lot 309, p. 165, is to be accepted literally. The account, which was probably written about 1705, states that Defoe lives "on Newington Green, at his father-in-law's House; who is a Lay elder of a conventicle there."

² Calendar of Treasury Books, XIII. (London, 1933), p. 151.

³ See James R. Sutherland, "A Note on the Last Years of Defoe," *Modern Language Review*, April 1934.

GARRICK'S PRESENTATION OF *ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA*

BY GEORGE WINCHESTER STONE, JR.

THE production of *Antony and Cleopatra*, one of Garrick's most judicious handlings of Shakespeare and one upon which he expended a great deal of time and money, was not, apparently, the success he had hoped for. Perhaps for that reason it has received but casual comment from his biographers. Yet I feel that it warrants study, if for no other reason, because it reveals an attitude and an ideal that cannot be too carefully considered with regard to Shakespeare's priest of the eighteenth century.

It was Garrick's passionate desire, as his biographer Davies says, to give his audience as much of England's greatest dramatist as possible.¹ He avowed as much himself in the prologue he wrote and spoke for the opening of Drury Lane Theatre, September 8, 1750 :

Sacred to SHAKESPEARE was this spot design'd
To pierce the heart and humanize the mind.

And during the first eighteen years of his connection with the stage, from 1741 to 1759, he made fifteen different Shakespearian characters live for London audiences as they had not lived since the days of Betterton. And also during that period he produced without taking a rôle himself eleven other Shakespearian plays.²

Few if any theatrical managers, however, have been able to dictate absolutely to an audience ; and Garrick was no exception, for eighteenth-century audiences were remarkably articulate and

¹ *Dramatic Miscellanies*, ii. 368.

² He played : Richard III, Hamlet, Hamlet's Ghost, Lear, Macbeth, King John, Falconbridge, Othello, Iago, Henry IV, Hotspur, Chorus to *Henry V*, Benedick, Romeo, and Leontes. He produced : *Merchant of Venice*, *Twelfth Night*, *Measure for Measure*, *Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Henry VIII*, *Coriolanus*, *Tempest* (an adaptation and also the original), *Midsummer Night's Dream* (opera), *Taming of the Shrew* (reduced to a farce, *Catherine and Petruccio*), *All's Well*, and *As You Like It*.

forceful in expressing their likes and dislikes. If his ideals did not square with the desires of those who filled his pit, boxes, and galleries he had to submit, change, and rearrange his offering for their pleasure. He reminded his spectators of their responsibility in the quality of theatrical entertainment served up for them in the remaining lines of the prologue mentioned above :

But if an empty House, the Actor's curse,
Shews us our Lear's, and Hamlet's lose their force :
Unwilling we must change the nobler scene
And in our turn present you Harlequin ;
Quit Poets and set Carpenters to work
Shew gaudy scenes, or mount the vaulting Turk :
For though we Actors, one and all, agree
Boldly to struggle for our—vanity,
If want comes on, Importance must retreat :
Our first great ruling passion is—to eat.

Garrick may still be, as he so often has been, criticized for giving adulterated versions of Shakespeare while claiming that it was "his wish, his joy, his only plan to lose no drop of that immortal man." Yet with all his imperfections and shortcomings, real or imagined by careless critics, his significant contribution to the stage was that he caused Shakespeare to live for hosts of people over a period of thirty-five years, made the mid-eighteenth century, as it were, Shakespeare-conscious, and thus provided a profitable market for Shakespearian material without which the numerous editors and critics could not have existed.¹ Another not insignificant contribution he made was that without obviously running counter to the stream of eighteenth-century taste he helped to shape its course anew by calling to its attention more of the real values of Shakespeare than it had hitherto been accustomed to recognize.

With regard to this accomplishment the production of *Antony and Cleopatra*, on January 3, 1759, is important. After the second performance an anonymous correspondent wrote to him full of appreciation :

Sir, Amongst other obligations you confer on the public, that of

¹ According to Jaggard's *Bibliography*, before Garrick came to the stage, in 1741, there were only three editors of Shakespeare in the eighteenth century, and only a dozen different printings of his works. While during the period from 1741 to 1800 there were fifteen different editors and fifty different printings of his collected works in England alone, to say nothing of the vast number of separate plays and the eighteen printings in Scotland and Ireland. Bell's edition, 1773-74, was dedicated to Garrick, and over 800 sets were sold in one week.

restoring Shakespeare to the stage is not the least: ¹ men of real discernment and true taste observe your attention here with particular pleasure and applause; and are glad to see his *Antony and Cleopatra* without the trimmings of Dryden, or the varnish of any inferior hand.²

It must be confessed that the purpose of this letter was not pure praise of a noble attempt on Garrick's part, for its author enclosed a prologue which he had written and which he hoped Garrick would speak on the occasion of the next performance. Yet it expresses an attitude that twentieth-century critics would wish to see more of in the eighteenth century.

Each season, of course, the theatrical managers were required to present new plays as well as the old favourites. *Antony and Cleopatra* was one of the new plays which Garrick offered, and it is necessary to review in brief the tendencies of the London theatres in order to realize why he chose that particular play. The decade 1750-60 was marked in the history of the English stage by the growth of pantomimes, pageants, and operas. The great exponent of these spectacle shows was John Rich, manager of Covent Garden, who himself, as Mr. Lun, was a remarkable pantomimic actor and a master of elaborate stage devices. His efforts in this type of drama had caused considerable embarrassment to Wilks, Booth, and Cibber in their dramatic attempts earlier in the century.³ After a lull in his activities—a period of time from 1741 to 1747 when Garrick and Quin filled his house and treasury, and when Harlequin's wand contributed little or nothing—he again exerted himself during the fifties.⁴

¹ This is no place to continue the fallacy once prevalent that it was Garrick who retrieved Shakespeare from oblivion for the joy of the English stage. The revival started before his time. He emphasized in a remarkable way a current that had already been set in motion by others.

² Boaden, *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, 1831, i. 20. The writer signs himself J.B.

³ Cibber explains the situation in his *Apology*, 3rd edition, 1750, p. 422 ff.: "I have upon several Occasions already observ'd, that when one Company is too hard for another, the lower in Reputation, has always been forced to exhibit fine new-fangled Foppery, to draw the Multitude after them: . . . Dancing therefore was, now, the only Weight, in the opposite Scale, and as the New Theatre sometimes found their Account in it, it could not be safe for us wholly to neglect it. To give even Dancing therefore some Improvement, and to make it something more than Motion without Meaning, the Fable of *Mars* and *Venus*, was form'd into a connected Presentation of Dances in Character, wherein the Passions were so happily expressed, and the whole Story so intelligibly told, by a mute Narration of Gesture only, that even thinking Spectators allow'd it both a pleasing and a rational Entertainment; . . . From this original Hint, then, . . . sprung forth that Succession of monstrous Medlies that have so long infested the Stage, and which rose upon one another alternately, at both Houses outvying, in Expence, like contending bribes on both sides at an Election to secure a Majority of the Multitude."

⁴ Doran, *Annals of the Stage*, 1890, ii. 44.

Garrick naturally had to compete with him in this field; so he enlisted the aid of Henry Woodward, who as a pantomimic artist was second only to Rich. And each year from 1750 to 1756 Woodward produced a new pantomime and each met with overwhelming success. That his *Queen Mab*, *Harlequin Ranger*, *The Genii*, *Fortunatus*, *Proteus*, or *Harlequin in China*, and *Mercury Harlequin* proved popular enough to satisfy the desires of the managers and entertaining enough to draw crowds of people is indicated by the box receipts they provided, by the long runs they enjoyed as afterpieces at Drury Lane, and by the fact that they were kept in the repertoire of the theatre for years afterwards.¹ Yet that Garrick was hardly satisfied with this Harlequinade is evidenced in the closing lines of his Epilogue to *Barbarossa*:

I therefore now propose, by your command,
That tragedies no more shall cloud the land;
Send o'er your Shakespeare to the sons of France,
Let *them* grow grave—let *us* begin to dance!
Banish your gloomy scenes to foreign climes,
Reserve alone to bless these golden times,
A farce or two—and Woodward's pantomimes.²

On February 3, 1755, Garrick tried his hand at opera and produced the *Fairies*, plundering Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's*

¹ On December 26, 1750, *Queen Mab* was produced. It ran continuously for thirty nights and by the end of the season had been presented forty-five times. The total box receipts on the nights when this was played amounted to £6,615. On December 26, 1751, a "New Pantomime call'd *Harlequin Ranger* compos'd by Mr. Woodward went off with great Applause," according to Richard Cross, Prompter, whose manuscript diary furnishes this information. It had a continuous run of fourteen nights, and completed the season with twenty-six; receipts when it was performed came to £3,961. On December 26, 1752, a third of Woodward's conceptions, *An Arabian Night's Entertainment call'd the Genii*, went off with great applause. It had an unbroken run of twenty-five nights and finished the season with a count of forty-nine, which brought the managers £6,030. On December 26, 1753, a fourth creation, called *Fortunatus*, was produced, with the usual comment by Cross, "went off with great Applause," and continued for seventeen nights without interruption. It entertained audiences another seventeen times before the season closed and helped bring to the managers on the nights it was performed £4,870. On January 4, 1755, a "new Pantomime called *Proteus*, or *Harlequin in China* went off but indifferently, the scenes being liked but not the action." However it continued for eighteen nights and had been performed thirty-two times before the season was over, and brought box receipts amounting to £4,856. And on December 27, 1756, *Mercury Harlequin* was produced. It ran continuously eighteen nights and finished the season with thirty-three performances. The receipts on the nights when it was performed amounted to £5,350.

² December 17, 1754. The proper note to substantiate a statement with regard to the popularity of Woodward and his pantomime would be the reproduction of that eighteenth-century print which shows all the actors of Drury Lane in one side of a scales and Woodward in the other making them kick the beam.

Dream. It was new enough and spectacular enough to be played without the complement of an afterpiece, and went off with "great applause." Its first night brought the managers £200, and the next nine performances, stretching until November 7, 1755, brought in £1,360. At the opening of the season of 1755 Garrick decided to out-do Rich in spectacle, dance, and pageantry, and, after long rehearsal, produced on November 8 the ill-fated *Chinese Festival*, which, because of outbreak of war with France and the consequent distaste for his imported French dancers and costumes, lost the managers £4,000.¹ On February 11, 1756, he offered the *Tempest*, an opera from Shakespeare, composed by Mr. Smith, Handel's pupil. The manager wrote for it an introductory dialogue between an actor and a critic in which he tried to justify the alteration :

Critic : What ! are we to be quivered and quavered out of our senses ? Give me Shakespeare, in all his force, vigour, and spirit ! What ! would you make a eunuch of him ? No Shakesporellis for my money.

Actor : Let us calmly consider this complaint of yours. If it is well founded I will submit with pleasure ; if not you will. . . . To the point, sir : What are your objections to this night's entertainment ?

Critic : I hate opera.

Actor : You hate music, perhaps ?

Critic : And dancing too.

Actor : But why, pray ?

Critic : They pervert nature. Legs are made for walking, tongues for speaking ; and therefore capering and quavering are unnatural and abominable.

Actor : You like Shakespeare ?

Critic : Like him ! adore him ! worship him ! There's no capering and quavering in his works.

Actor : Have a care,

"The man that hath no music in himself
Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds
Is fit for treasons, strategems, and spoils ;
The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
And his affections dark as Erebus :
Let no such man be trusted. . . ."

Richard Cross, Drury Lane's prompter, who kept a most interesting series of notebook-records of the performances,² remarks that on the first night this introductory dialogue was hissed, but the

¹ The account of this famous failure, as well as the statistics with regard to the *Fairies*, may be read in the manuscript notes in the *Diary of Richard Cross*, in the Folger Shakespeare Library.

² Folger Shakespeare Library.

second time was called for and applauded. The piece had six performances during the rest of the season, but was not an overwhelming success.¹ On October 20, 1756, the *Tempest* as written by Shakespeare was revived.

Spectacle, pantomime, and opera, however, still succeeded at Covent Garden. And Woodward left Drury Lane to become manager of a new theatre in Ireland in partnership with Barry.

So in the summer of 1758 Garrick was put to it to offer a new sort of spectacle. If he could find one in which he could also display his own powers of acting the possibility of triumphing over competition would be even greater. Moreover, he wished to produce one which would further his ideal of adding lustre to Shakespeare's name. Of the dozen plays of Shakespeare he had not yet attempted,² *Antony and Cleopatra* seemed to offer the most in the way of pageantry, poetry, and action.

The staging of this play has always been considered well nigh impossible. There is no record of its performance before Garrick's time.³ Here then was something new and grand which offered an opportunity for Shakespeare to triumph over Dryden. It had to be revised somewhat for the stage, however, and in doing this Garrick enlisted the aid of his friend Edward Capell, who at that time was working on his edition of Shakespeare's plays and borrowing from Garrick's enormous library to do so. The plan, as it proved, was to render the play actable by excision and rearrangement only, not by the addition of scenes or the creation of new speeches.

Unfortunately there is very little information in letters, newspapers, memoirs, or magazines with reference to the production of the play or of the preparations for it. The preparations, however, began at least five months before the first performance, for on August 3, 1758, Garrick received a request from William Young for the loan of his Roman "shapes" for use in some play by his amateur group. Garrick immediately answered him as follows:

I have this Moment receiv'd Your most agreeable Letter & am Sorry that I have not time to answer it paragraph by paragraph, but it is now ten o'clock & I must not lose a post—Our Roman Shapes at Drury

¹ Box receipts for the six performances only £740.

² *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Love's Labour Lost*, *Comedy of Errors*, *Richard II*, *Henry VI*, *Timon*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Julius Caesar*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*.

³ E. K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, ii. 213, assigns the acting of *Antony and Cleopatra* to the year 1606. Downes and Langbaine have nothing to say of its performance.

Lane are so very bad, that we are now making new ones for y^e Revival of Antony & Cleopatra, & our false trimming will not be put upon 'Em till a little time before they are Wanted as it is apt to tarnish wth lying by.¹

There was some stir of anticipation among the London theatre-going public long before the play was produced, however, on account of the unique way Garrick and Capell devised of advertising it. Capell finished his alteration, had it printed by October 23, 1758, and issued to the public to be read. And it was to be read with a difference. For in this edition he put forth a design he cherished of enabling people to read more dramatically. By the aid of certain marks of punctuation he hoped the readers would visualize the action in their minds' eyes upon an invisible stage, with the result that the print would take on an active as well as a poetic life.² The marks employed were in the main four in number.³ The first was a point of punctuation ranging with the top of the letter to distinguish irony, "which is often so delicately couch'd as to escape the notice even of the attentive reader." The second was a dash ranging with the top of the letter to indicate change of address—(within a speech, however, it ranged with the bottom—). The third was a cross with one bar to indicate a thing pointed to, placed before the proper word signified, and a cross with two bars to indicate a thing delivered, such as a letter or a sword, placed before the word describing the thing handed over. The fourth of these symbols involved the use of inverted commas to indicate an aside. Capell's hope was that these marks would be universally accepted and hence do away with marginal comments.

Rehearsals were finished and the staging material was completed by the third of January 1759, on which evening a crowded London audience beheld the play. The actors not only had new costumes with fresh trimmings, but the scenery backs and flats were new also—

¹ Unpublished letter, Folger Library, Case II, 5, 1414³.

² The forthright Warburton, no friend of Capell's, was presented by Garrick with a copy of this play on December 30, 1758, and on the morning of the first performance wrote to Garrick making fun of Capell's punctuation, but praising the actor:

"The play is extremely well printed, and without doubt the mysterious marks you speak of mean something; but I think it would [not] be an impertinent curiosity in the public to ask what? . . . Whatsoever advantage, I say, Shakespeare may receive from the whims of his dead editors, he will this night receive a lustre from an living one, which I make no doubt was in his own idea when he wrote the play." (Boaden, *op. cit.*, i. 92.)

³ Fully explained in Capell's preface to *Prolusions or select Pieces of ancient Poetry*, London, 1760.

all in an effort to make the pageant shine. Cross remarks in his record book, "Wed. 3rd. Antony and Cleopatra reviv'd (Shakespeare's) This play tho' all new dress'd & had fine Scenes did not seem to give y^e Audience any great pleasure or draw any Applause."

Despite this unenthusiastic report of its first appearance it was produced four more times in the month of January and ended its run with a performance on May 18. Financially it was more successful than the *Fairies* or the *Tempest* opera, playing, save once, to houses of £200 or over—which is perhaps a tribute to Shakespeare. No farce or afterpiece was considered necessary to supplement the performance or fill out the bill of entertainment.

The first problem with which Garrick and Capell had to deal was the formal division of the play into acts and scenes capable of stage production. This problem has always presented itself to editors and producers because there is no act and scene division in the first four folios. Rowe, in 1709, arranged the play in five acts and twenty-seven scenes. Pope, in 1723, changed the act division slightly and broke the play into forty-one scenes. Theobald, in 1733, retained Pope's act division, but reduced the scenes to twenty-nine. Hanmer, in 1744, divided the play into forty-two scenes with the same five acts. Warburton, in 1747, retained Pope's act division and forty-one scenes, but regrouped them. Dr. Johnson, in 1765, returned to forty-two scenes, but divided them differently. Capell, in his 1768 edition, made a five act play of thirty-eight scenes, and the Cambridge text of 1866, by Clark and Wright, has been worked into a still different division of the forty-two scenes.

The version of the play which Capell used as a basis for his acting alteration is among the many Garrick treasures in the Folger Shakespeare Library, annotated and arranged in his own careful hand.¹ There are, however, only a few minor differences between this and the printed edition of 1758. Capell used a 1734 duodecimo reprint of Rowe's text containing five acts and twenty-seven scenes. When he and Garrick finished altering this text it still had five acts and twenty-seven scenes. But the actual place-changes on the shores of the Mediterranean were reduced to facilitate production.

The eighteenth-century audience saw from the boards of Drury

¹ A volume, bound in half calf, of 96 pages, entitled, "*Antony and Cleopatra*, a tragedy, by Mr. William Shakespeare, London: printed for J. Tonson and the rest of the proprietors; and sold by the booksellers of London and Westminster, MDCCXXXIV."

Lane theatre a play which opened more rapidly than the original. It saw Thyreus and Dolabella, friends to Cæsar, usurping the lines of Philo and Demetrius, and discussing Antony, the triple pillar of the world transformed into a strumpet's fool. It beheld Antony dismissing the Roman ambassadors and urging Rome to melt in Tiber, and the wide arch of the ranged Empire to fall while he embraced Cleopatra. And all this is Shakespeare. But immediately upon the exit of the couple it heard Thyreus speak the words of Enobarbus, which come in Act II., Scene ii. in the reading text, describing Cleopatra when her barge like a burnished throne "burn'd on the water" of the Cydnus. Thus Cleopatra in that marvellous description was made glorious and wonderful at the outset.

A much more rapid progress in the first three acts is achieved by the alteration. Some scenes are cut, while others are telescoped. The cuts are made in general with a view to concentrating upon the tragedy of Love, and of minimizing the political and historical implications. Garrick knew that it was feeling rather than ancient history that affected audiences. This results in a lessening of the complexity of action and characters. Four friends of Antony, Ventidius, Scarus, Demetrius, and Philo, are entirely cut from the play, and what speeches of theirs remain are given, as already stated, to Thyreus and Dolabella. Three friends of Pompey suffer the same fate, Gallus, Menecrates, and Varrius. The excision of the Ventidius scene in Parthia and of Antony's life in Athens, neither of which bears directly on the Cleopatra story, renders the play more stageable.

Two scenes are cut from the fourth act. One is that in which Cæsar learns of the savage treatment of his messenger and pouts about Antony's acts, saying, "He calls me boy and chides as he had power to beat me out of Egypt." The other is that in which Antony makes his servants weep at the thought of a last and parting banquet, the scene in which Cleopatra cannot understand him. With this also goes that short scene where the Soldier remarks about the strange sounds of music in the air, "Tis the God Hercules, who loved Antony, now leaves him." The act begins with the bedroom scene where Eros and Cleopatra arm Antony for battle.

There is no cutting in the fifth act, save five lines from the Clown, who brings the figs and asps, which comment upon the proportion of women that the devil mars.

A general summary of the cuts shows that a few lines of *double entendre* mostly among the low folk are omitted, and that political scenes and short introductory ones which complicate the characters are discarded. Guards, attendants, servants, watchmen, and messengers are reduced and less diversified. The text of the play is one of the longest of Shakespeare's, 3,444 lines in the 1734 edition. The alteration is 657 lines shorter. Capell added three of his own, and extended the drinking song at the banquet on Pompey's galley to another verse.¹

Finally, as the fuller stage directions indicate, an emphasis was put upon the spectacle.

Three questions might well be asked at this point. Have the characters gained or lost by this rearrangement? Has the poetry been sacrificed in accordance with the regular rule of cutting, *i.e.* of lopping off the descriptive and meditative lines and retaining the dramatic? Has the play been bettered?

Two characters, Pompey and Octavia, have dwindled from individuals with lives of their own to rather insignificant puppets used for background purposes. The first no longer parleys politically with Cæsar nor cries out to Menecrates for Cleopatra to hold Antony and for her Epicurean cooks to "sharpen with cloyless sauce his appetite, that sleep and feeding may prorogue his honour even till a lethe'd dullness." His only appearance is on the galley, where he refuses to be master of the world by not allowing Menas to cut first the cable then the throats of Antony, Cæsar, and Lepidus.

¹ The lines which Capell added include some of Shakespeare's words and form a necessary introduction to the description of Cleopatra on her barge:

Dol. Triumphant Lady!—Fame, I see, is true.

Thy. Too true: Since she first met *Mark Antony*

Upon the river *Cydnus*, he has been hers.

The Shakespeare text reads:

Mecænas. She's a most triumphant lady; if Report be square of her.

Enobarbus. When she first met *Mark Antony* she purs'd up his Heart upon the river *Cydnus*. . . .

The verse reads:

Monarch, come; and with thee bring

Tipsy dance and revelling:

In thy vats our cares be drown'd:

With thy grapes our hairs be crown'd;

Cup us, till the world go round,

Bur. Cup us till the world go round.

This verse does not appear in the 1734 copy marked by Capell, but is printed in his *Notes and Various Readings* (1774), i, 36.

The betrothal scene of Antony and Octavia is omitted, as is the scene where he parts from her to go to Athens. Their life at Athens and her concern to keep her brother and husband at peace are eliminated, so that she appears only once at Rome to learn that Antony's pleasure has taken him back to the soft beds of the East, and that she is most wretched. This glimpse is hardly sufficient to show the beauty and fidelity of her character. She has become a shadow that temporarily haunts and hampers Antony, and is really known to the audience only through report and the comments of Cleopatra as her messenger describes her.

Enobarbus has a number of his lines transferred to Thyreus, as already noted, and many of his humorous, blunt, satirical remarks are cut. But enough remain, along with his death scene, to individualize him and to make him a foil for a display of generosity on Antony's part.

Cæsar's character, though still a trifle ambiguous, suffers not at all despite the cuts, which are heaviest in those matters which concern politics. He is not made the entirely cold, rational, ambitious person for whom political power means everything. A side of his character is emphasized which has received little recognition from critics, that side which shows his state of mind throughout the play as a progressive disillusionment in an ideal—Antony. The impression must have been carried over to the eighteenth-century audience, as it is to the modern reader, that Cæsar, as a youngster who "kept his sword even like a dancer" on the plains of Philippi, watched with astonishment the mighty Antony dispatch his foes and made him his ideal hero, as did the thousands of other young soldiers who were so staunch in his support. It is, then, rather hard for Cæsar to realize that his and the soldiers' idol has feet of clay where Empire is concerned. The lines are retained in which he cries :

Antony,
Leave thy lascivious Wassails . . .

and in which he builds up the character of Antony as a fighter who can suffer with courage even the worst privations of war. After this there is a bitterness in his words to Octavia :

No, my most wrong'd Sister ; *Cleopatra*
Hath nodded him to her ; He hath given his Empire
Up to a whore ; who now are levying
The Kings o' the Earth for War.

The cutting of the next nine lines, which contain but a catalogue of poetical names, territories, and historical figures—Bocchus, king of Libya, Archelaus, of Cappadocia, Philadelphos, king of Paphlagonia, etc.—renders this disillusionment more poignant in its brevity of statement. At the end of the play, for a moment, his former idea of the hero Antony returns, and although the news of his death is "tidings to wash the eyes of kings" Cæsar wonders that the passing of such a world figure made no bigger crack in nature, and praises him.

In Shakespeare's play Cæsar can never give himself over to a moment's relaxation. Even at the Banquet on Pompey's galley his "puritan conscience" and sense of responsibility to things of greater moment never leave him. It is with misgivings, with a puckered face, and on account of policy that he allows himself to drink with the jovial Antony, who instead of concerning himself with the fate of the Empire passes his time making sport of the tipsy Lepidus, and who tries to bring young Cæsar into the spirit of the occasion :

Antony : (to Cæsar) Be a child o' th' time.

Cæsar : Possess it, I'll make answer ;

But I had rather fast from all, four Days,
Than drink so much in one.

This is cut by Garrick and Cæsar emerges more humanized.

Antony's character is not really harmed by cuts in his speeches or by the excision of those which praise him. His lines of political import are cut in Act II., Scene iii., where in the Shakespearian text he talks with Pompey. A short dialogue with the Soothsayer who tells him his demon is eclipsed by Cæsar's suffers the same fate. The love-making with Octavia in Rome and their life at Athens and the scene wherein he makes his servants weep before the farewell banquet in Alexandria are all absent. But withal he remains the unreserved, expansive, generous soldier-lover with capacity for splendid action and lusty enjoyment ; jealous at times and cruel, but as soon noble and tender ; fascinated with and undeceived by Cleopatra. He boasts and blusters according to his " Asiatic manner of speaking " ¹ and by little and little the understanding of the value of

¹ Plutarch, North's Translation, 1579, p. 971 :

" He used a manner of phrase in his speech call'd Asiatik which carried the best grace and estimation at that time, and which was much like to his manners and life : for it was full of ostentation, foolish braverie, and vain ambition."

the glory he has thrown away for love cuts him ; and yet his triumph is as grand as ever, and in it he surpasses the paltriness of Empire.

The lines of Egypt's Queen are scarcely touched. In all she speaks only seven less than Shakespeare gave her, and those cut are of minor importance. Consequently she shines as she does in Shakespeare.

The splendid poetic passages of the play are retained, for the best ones are in the last two acts, which receive the slightest excision. Five lines of Antony's bombastic rage at Thyreus are cut :

O, that I were
Upon the Hill of *Basan*, to out-roar
The horned Herd, for I have Savage Cause ;
And to proclaim it civilly, were like
A halter'd Neck, which does the Hangman thank
For being yare about him.

The poetizing of Antony about Octavia goes :

The *April's* in her Eyes ; it is Love's Spring.

But Antony's long speeches, such as the one wherein he describes himself and his fortunes to Eros to be as ephemeral as pictures we imagine in the clouds at evening, and those he speaks after he learns of Cleopatra's death—"Unarm me Eros ; the long Day's task is done and we must sleep . . ."—are kept entire. All of Cleopatra's speeches in the last act are likewise retained.

In answer to our third question : from Garrick's, a great manager's and producer's, point of view the alteration is a better play. It is less complicated in plot, less diversified in characters, and requires fewer changes of scene. Yet it retains the grandeur of the original, and with the addition of costume and spectacular scenery it was a worthy production.

The theory behind the alteration, whether Capell's or Garrick's, or, most likely, a combination of both, is obvious. The play was to be made more than a spectacle such as Goethe's Manager advised his Poet in the prelude to *Faust* :

A show they want, they come to gape and stare,
Spin for their eyes abundant occupation. . . .

Although the audience seemed to care for that sort of entertainment, it was to combine dramatic action and clash of personalities, and a presentation of real characters.

That there is a genuine inner struggle in the minds of these characters cannot be doubted. The main ones are always thinking and acting on from two to four different planes. Antony is concerned in his every action with thoughts of Fulvia or Octavia, with his past military glory and his present luxurious sloth, with his own desires, and with his soldiers' opinion of him. And the emphasis upon one thought or the other depends not so much upon the lines as upon the actor's understanding and interpretation, his half glances, motions, carriage, gestures, and looks. It is this ability of an intelligent actor that makes characters live, Lamb to the contrary notwithstanding; and it was Garrick's ability in this art that earned for him among his contemporaries the epithet of "best commentator on Shakespeare."¹

It is this inner conflict that contributes to the infinite variety of Cleopatra, who, though she may live for feeling and be as marvellous a companion to Antony as Bradley points out,² is yet concerned inwardly with her own position—as queen, as Antony's mistress in relation to Fulvia and Octavia, with fear of Cæsar and a penetrative understanding of him, and a double fear of her place in a Roman Triumph. All this is in one side of the scales and her love for Antony is in the other. It is a complex situation.

Cæsar thinks on several planes also: his ideal of the soldier Antony opposed by his disgust of the lover; a loyalty to a friend as opposed to personal ambition for complete political power, which last is further complicated by his scheming to get Cleopatra alive in his triumph against his fascination by her as a woman.

Enobarbus is troubled with his simple faithfulness to his master and a rational viewpoint of the folly of continuing to serve a man of fallen fortunes.

¹ Time and again Garrick received this. P.W. (Peter Whalley?) writing to him February 20, 1744, (Boaden, i. 23.) says: "Sir: as you seem to me to be a very good judge of Shakespeare and have often given us his true sense and meaning where his learned editors could give us neither, I shall submit to your judgment a line from Hamlet." The highest tribute of all is paid Garrick by George Steevens in a letter of December 27, 1763: "I am contented with the spirit of the author you first taught me to admire, and when I found you could do so much for him, I was naturally curious to know the value of the materials he had supplied you with; and often when I have taken my pen in hand to try to illustrate a passage, I have thrown it down again with discontent when I remembered how able you were to clear that difficulty by a single look, or particular modulation of voice, which a long and laboured paraphrase was insufficient to explain half so well" (Boaden, i. 216-17). See also Boaden, i. 333 for J. Sharp's reiteration of this opinion and i. 92 for Warburton's comment.

² *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*, 1909, pp. 280-305.

Even Dolabella has his inner conflict. He is absolutely trusted by Cæsar to aid him in capturing Cleopatra alive, yet, succumbing to her fascinations, breaks that trust and informs her as to Cæsar's real plans, thus giving her the opportunity to cheat the emperor of his triumph.

With the dramatic features thus carefully kept, the alteration preserved the poetry of Shakespeare, and offered the eighteenth century a romantic tragedy in a classical setting. Garrick had every reason to believe that it was opportune both as to time and to subject, and that without going against the stream of eighteenth-century taste he could artfully introduce to his audience the real Shakespeare.

Why, then, was it not the success he anticipated? Let us look first at the accounts of contemporaries who saw the performance. Of the very few left us that of Davies, who himself played the part of Eros, is perhaps most significant:

Mr. Garrick, from his passionate desire to give the public as much of their admired poet as possible, reviv'd it [*Antony and Cleopatra*], as altered by Mr. Capel, with all the advantages of new scenes, habits, and other decorations proper to the play. However, it did not answer his own and the public expectation. It must be confessed, that, in Antony, he wanted one necessary accomplishment: his person was not sufficiently important and commanding to represent the part. There is more dignity of action than variety of passion in the character, though it is not deficient in the latter. The actor, who is obliged continually to traverse the stage, should from person attract respect, as well as from the power of speech. Mrs. Yates was then a young actress and had not manifested such proofs of genius, and such admirable elocution, as she has since displayed; but her fine figure and pleasing manner of speaking were well adapted to the enchanting Cleopatra. Mossop wanted the essential part of Enobarbus, humour.¹

A pamphlet, which is now rather inaccessible, was written anonymously and sold in the London shops for sixpence in 1759, entitled, *A Letter to the Hon. Author of the New Farce call'd the Rout, to which is Sub-joined an Epistle to Mr. Garrick, upon that and other theatrical subjects with an appendix containing some remarks upon the new Reviv'd play Antony and Cleopatra*.² It falls into three parts, as the title suggests, the first of which is an ironical criticism of Dr. Hill's Farce, the second a severe and ironical criticism of Garrick as manager, and the third a similar attack which, however, gives some light on the contemporary reception of *Antony and Cleopatra*:

¹ Dramatic Miscellanies (1783), ii. 368.

² Copies are in the Harvard College and Boston Public Libraries.

Since the penning of the preceding letter, the reviv'd tragedy of *Antony and Cleopatra* has been performed and published. With respect to the piece itself we are told in the title page, that it is "fitted for the stage, by abridging only." As the length of this play was certainly an obstacle to its exhibition, we are of opinion its alterations are so much for the better, as they have rendered it less tedious, as well for the audience as the actors. I cannot, however, but be of opinion that this piece is inferior to most of Shakespeare's productions, and that it gives way to Dryden's *All for Love, or the World Well Lost*, which is founded on the same historical event; I do not mean by this to give the preference to Dryden as a greater dramatic poet in general than Shakespeare, but must own that his soft flowing numbers are more sympathetic to the tender passion which this story is so particularly animated with, than the general language of Shakespeare's Antony.

I doubt not this assertion will be looked upon as blasphemy by the *Garicians* and *Shakespearean-bigots* who imagine that no piece of this great poet can be less than perfections-self, especially when it has received the polish of Roscius pen. . . .

In this form has the new-reviv'd tragedy (so much talked of and so long expected) of Antony and CLEOPATRA appeared. To give the editor his due, the punctuation is very regular; in this I think his principal merit consists; that of the printer is much greater; the neatness of the type, the disposition of the parts, and the accuracy of the composing, are very striking; and these considerations apart, we can see no reason for imposing an additional tax of sixpence upon the purchasers of this play, containing less in quantity than the original which may be had for half its price.

However, this piece has already been twice performed to crowded houses. We shall not attempt to depreciate Mr. G——k in quality of an actor, or pretend to assert Mr. F—— surpasses or equals him. The town is already very well acquainted with both their merit; and it were almost needless to say they both appear to advantage in their parts. Mrs. Y——s's person is well suited to the character, and though she is an inferior CLEOPATRA to Mrs. Woffington, she is not without sufficient powers to procure her applause. Upon the whole, we think this play is now better suited for the stage than the closet, as scenery, dresses, and parade strike the eye, and divert one's attention from the poet.

It is this sort of criticism that drove Garrick to France three years later.

In the year 1773 Garrick wrote to Steevens asking, among other things, for suggestions as to a new Shakespeare play to revive:

Have you Ever thought of any Play unreviv'd in Shakespeare, that would bring Credit to us well decorated & carefully got up?—What think you of Rich^d 2^d? or of the rest?—An^y & Cleopatra I reviv'd some years ago, when I & Mrs. Yates were Younger—it gain'd ground Every time it was play'd, but I grew Tir'd, & gave it up,—the part was laborious—

I should be glad to Employ our Painter upon some capital Creditable Performance.¹

Perhaps Garrick's statement is true that though the play grew in appreciation each time that he played it he grew tired of a laborious part. Certainly the last night that he played it he was out of physical condition, for on May 20, 1759, he wrote to Wilson :

I was so ill & Weak with a kind of bilious Colick when I play'd Anthony, that I was not in a condition the next morn^g to do half my Business, that I should have done.²

Steevens answered Garrick's letter as follows :

As to King Richard the Second, it is surely the most uninteresting and flattest of all the number. A few splendid passages will not maintain a play on the stage. For my own part I had rather see any of the parts of King Henry the Fourth. . . . Surely Troilus and Cressida would do more, if it were well clipped and decorated. Quin played Thersites with success ; and what has once pleased may please again. Your Antony and Cleopatra was a splendid performance ; but you were out of love with it because it afforded you few opportunities of showing those sharp turns and that coachmanship in which you excel all others.³

The sum, then, of contemporary opinion points three possible reasons for the discontinuance of a play which proved to be above the average in popularity : first, a hostile group of critics and their effect upon an always sensitive manager ; second, the feeling that Garrick had not the opportunity to shine as he did in *Richard III*, *Macbeth*, *Lear*, and *Hamlet* because of his size and the nature of the part of Antony, and had also to share honours with Cleopatra ; third, that the company was not sufficiently good to carry the parts of the other characters, and that the task with which Garrick was faced was, therefore, all the harder.

To these may be added a fourth, hinted, perhaps, by the author of the *Letter to the Hon. Author of the New Farce call'd the Rout*, and expanded by later critics such as Knight and Gaehde, that so popular was *All for Love* that it held, from the Restoration until well into the nineteenth century, possession all but undisputed of the stage.⁴

As a matter of fact, a glance at the records of the theatres will show that if any play drove *Antony and Cleopatra* from the stage

¹ Folger Library, Holograph letter separately bound, 2075 ms.

² Folger Library, Case I, 7,621^a.

³ Boaden, *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*.

⁴ J. Knight, *Life of David Garrick* (1894), pp. 170-171.

it was Murphy's *Orphan of China* and not Dryden's *All for Love*. For the latter play, however popular during the Restoration and during the early eighteenth century, was played but six times at Drury Lane in the fifty-three years from 1747-1800 and but twice during Garrick's whole term of management. It was, during these last fifty years of the eighteenth century, played at Covent Garden only sixteen times—not a popular record even on the basis of eighteenth-century standards. Davies pointed out in 1793 in his *Dramatic Miscellanies* that since the time of Wilks, Booth, and Cibber *All for Love* had gradually sunk into oblivion.¹

Murphy's *Orphan of China* had a romantic novelty in subject matter that was becoming popular, besides the backing of Voltaire's play on the same theme.² Pekin was stranger to the eighteenth century than Rome or Alexandria. The prologue, written by William Whitehead, the poet laureate, is perhaps indicative of a new romantic interest in the strange and far away :

Enough of Greece and Rome. Th' exhausted store
Of either nation now can charm no more :
Ev'n adventitious helps in vain we try,
Our triumphs languish in the public eye ;
And grave processions, musically slow,
Here pass unheeded,—as a Lord Mayor's shew.

The *Orphan of China* demanded less of a manager than *Antony and Cleopatra*, inasmuch as it preserved the unities of time, place, and action. Garrick and Mrs. Yates were successful in the characters of Zamti and Mandane.

It is, perhaps, natural but in a way unfortunate that all subsequent producers have looked at *Antony and Cleopatra* from the point of view of spectacle and not interpretation of character.³ The modern sound picture, if the right actors could be found, might present it excellently, and could easily overcome the difficult problem of scene changes. It would be an effort worthy of trial, and a triumph for the manager who succeeded. To Garrick, however, must go the credit for first staging the play, after Shakespeare's time, and for

¹ ii. 369 ff.

² Its first appearance was April 21, 1759, and it was performed nine more times until the end of the season. Only once, however, did it play to a house of over £180, and that was its last night for Verney's benefit when the box receipts were £300. No play had a long run that year. Otway's *Orphan* was played nine nights, Mrs. Centlivre's *Busy Body* eight, and *Romeo and Juliet* five.

³ For accounts of these subsequent performances see Odell, *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, or the *Furness Variorum*.

presenting in it unadulterated Shakespeare to an age which was all too used to viewing "improved" versions of his works. Garrick's ideal was high, and though his audience may have failed to appreciate it, critics who mark his *Antony and Cleopatra* a failure must remember that he never played it to an empty house.

TWO LETTERS FROM WORDSWORTH TO ROBERT JONES

BY HERBERT G. WRIGHT

AMONG recent acquisitions of the National Library of Wales are two letters from Wordsworth to Robert Jones, which, by the courtesy of the Librarian, Mr. W. Ll. Davies, I am enabled to print. They are catalogued as N.L.W. MSS. 10370 and 10614. The first is dated October 29, 1833, and the second, though the year is omitted, was evidently written on March 30, 1835. Like so many of Wordsworth's letters at this time, they are melancholy in tone, full of references to the bodily weakness of the poet or his relatives or to the death of old friends, with many of whom he had been in touch since his college days. There were also others of a younger generation, such as Arthur Henry Hallam, whose loss he deplored. One can understand therefore that he clung all the more tenaciously to Robert Jones, with whom were associated so many memories of his early manhood. Jones had visited him at Rydal Mount in October, 1831, and in 1833, though their friendship had been so recently renewed by personal contact, Wordsworth hopes "that we may meet again before *we* go hence & be no more seen." A visit is again suggested in 1835. Whether it took place or not I have been unable to discover. By 1837 Jones was dead and Crabb Robinson records in his diary that as he and Wordsworth travelled from Milan to Como in the summer of that year, the poet's delight in the beauty of the scenery was mingled with "painfully pleasing recollections of his old friend Jones, with whom he made the same journey in the year 1794."¹

The letters run as follows :

I

Rydal Mount Oct 29 [18]33

My dear Jones

Your letter rec^d this morning was very acceptable, & the more so as it gave so favourable an account of your own health & the re-establishment of your Brothers—Tho with the drawback on the part of your two Sisters—to whom pray present our best good wishes. I should not have replied to your letter quite so soon, but on account

¹ W. Knight, *The Life of William Wordsworth*, Edinburgh, 1889, vol. iii, p. 279.

of a paragraph which is going the round of the Newspapers respecting the state of my sight¹—which in all probability may fall in your way, & therefore I wish you to know, that the account was not much exaggerated—but thank God! the apprehended blindness of the one eye that was so severely affected, has passed away; & I am now in as fair a way of perfect recovery as any one has a right to expect, who has been subject to such frequent attacks as I have. My safety for the future, next to God's goodness, must depend upon extreme care, both as to diet & exposure, & above all in not fatiguing my mind by intellectual labor, after the eyes become at all disordered—the severity of the last relapse was occasioned, I believe, by want of this precaution: when unable to read or write, one is naturally put upon thinking, & in my case upon Composition, which always more or less disturbs the digestion, & is accordingly injurious, even when it does not over stimulate the brain. This attack commenced the very day I last wrote to you.

Your present of Books you mention I have not received—if they have come to Mr Hodskin's hands, there will be no difficulty in their reaching me—as we can communicate with Liverpool free of expence thro' several channels. I will cause enquiry to be made of Mr H immediatly.

You alluded to a Welsh & En: Dictionary—those I presume are in the Parcel—they will be truly acceptable, as I often wish to consult a book of that kind.²

My Sister has been doing surprizingly well for many months, till within these three days past, when she had a bilious attack, which has reduced her a good deal, & is most unfortunate as we have now the winter to face. These last seven weeks have been very melancholy ones, as we have lost no less than 7 or 8 intimate acquaintances or friends & relatives, of all ages from 23 to 70 inclusive—the last taken was a very old friend a Mr Cookson, a manufacturer in Kendal, who having been unfortunate in business, had retired for economys sake, to the Isle of Man, where he was living with his wife & there he died of Cholera—two months ago we lost Mrs W

¹ For an account of Wordsworth's defective eyesight and its effect upon him, cf. E. C. Batho, *The Later Wordsworth*, London, 1933, pp. 318–36. The period 1833–4 was an especially trying one. Among the papers which published reports of his impending blindness was the *Literary Gazette*.

² This was evidently W. O. Pughe's *Abridgement of the Welsh and English Dictionary*, published in 1826. It appears as No. 412 in the catalogue of Wordsworth's library, which was sold by auction on July 19–21, 1859. The copy bore the inscription "W. Wordsworth from Robert Jones."

eldest Brother after a painful illness.¹ A sad case was that of my young friend Hallam who was cut off at the age of 23—he was travelling with his father, the Author of the *Middle Ages*, & when sitting by him in a public room of a Hotel in Vienna, his father turned towards him & thought he had dropped asleep—but going up to him soon after, found he was dead. He was a young Man of genius, great acquirements & high promise.² Another of our young friends of Peter House Cambridge named Lionel Fraser died the other day of the age of 26—having been married & settled upon a Curacy in Shropshire—he has left a Widow & one Child.³ During my short summer excursion, I saw my lamented friend Mr Cookson at the Isle [of] Man, where his situation & character put into my head a little memorial of him which D. will transcribe making one of a seri[e]s⁴ of Sonnets, suggested during my ramble.⁵ Heartily do I concur with you in the wish that we may meet again, before *we* go hence & be no more seen. Our friendship has been most constant—never having suffered a moment's interruption, & being now of nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ a century's standing a serious thought & deserving our gratitude in more views than one. God bless you, with united love from Wife, Daughter & Sister ever faithfully yours,

W Wordsworth.

For this letter requiring haste, I cannot procure a frank.
[Superscription on the first page.]

Rushen Abbey.
near Ballasalla.⁶ Isle of Man

Broken in fortune but in mind intire
And sound in principle I seek repose
Where ancient trees this convent pile enclose
In ruin beautiful. When vain desire
Intrudes on peace I pray the Eternal Sire
To cast a soul-subduing Shade on me

¹ Cf. Wordsworth's letter to John Kenyon on September 23 (*Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, ed. W. Knight, 1907, iii. 17).

² Hallam died on September 15, 1833.

³ Admitted to Peterhouse on October 26, 1826, at the age of nineteen, graduated in 1831 and died on October 12, 1833, at Kinlet Vicarage, Salop, at the age of twenty-five.

⁴ Wordsworth wrote "serious."

⁵ Poems composed or suggested during a tour in the summer of 1833.

⁶ In the printed text "Bala-Sala."

A grey-haired pensive thankful Refugee ;
 A shade but with such sparks of holy fire
 As once were cherished here.¹ And when I note
 The old tower's brow yellowed as with the beams
 Of sunset ever there, & know that streams²
 Of stormy weather-stains that semblance wrought,
 I thank the silent Monitor and say
 Shine so my aged brow at all hours of the day.

[Addressed to :—]

The Rev^d Rob^t Jones
 Plas yn Llan
 near Ruthen
 N.W.

II

Trinity Lodge
 Mar 30 [1835.]³

My dear Friend

Your letter dated Fe^b 7th has remained far too long unanswered, a short time after the receipt of it, Mrs W & I started for London & took the letter along with us, meaning to reply to it, from that place, where we knew we could procure franks with great ease,—but during a residence of 5 weeks in Town whither we had gone on business—we were so much hurried & fatigued, that we had neither time nor spirits to sit down & write, in the way we wished to write to you. We have been now 3 days here, where we are like ships in harbour after a storm. My B^r tho' much harrassed by business, & having survived a dangerous attack of cholera last Autumn, is very active—& looking well for him.⁴ Two of his Sons, who are fellows of this College,⁵ are also well, & we have the pleasure of seeing them at all hours when they are not elsewhere engaged. You remember Greenwood,⁶ my old Schoolfellow—

¹ In the printed text "Once to these cells vouchsafed."

² In the printed text "albeit streams."

³ The year is omitted, but the letter bears the postmark "Ap. 1, 1835." Various references in the letter also point to this year. Wordsworth was still at Trinity Lodge on April 15 (cf. *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, iii. 75).

⁴ Christopher Wordsworth, Master of Trinity from 1820 to 1841.

⁵ John and Christopher were both made Fellows in 1830.

⁶ R. H. Greenwood, who was at Hawkshead with Wordsworth. He was 16th Wrangler in 1791, Minor Fellow in 1792, Major Fellow in 1794, and Senior Fellow from 1819 to 1840. He died on December 3, 1840.

he is still here residing as Senior fellow—he looks pretty well, but complains of many infirmities. I called upon the Master of St John's ¹ yesterday, but did not see him, he is said to wear well—I had a friend with me who took me thro' the Lodge & in the Combination room—I saw my own Picture—which the Master & Fellows did me the honour of subscribing for ²—it looks well, but is of too large a size for the room & would be seen to much more advantage in the Hall. But had there been room for it there, there is an objection to that place—the charcoal smoke I am told, is ruinous to Pictures, & this which is really well done cost much money.

We were glad to hear of your good health, & it was kind in you, giving a particular account of my old Friends of your family—I hope your brother will continue to be as careful of himself as the state of his constitution seems to require—pray give my kind remembrances to him, & best wishes to your Sisters. My own Sister continues to languish—as she may do perhaps for a long time—during 8 months of the year, she can scarcely be said to quit the House—& is not for a much less time confined to her room—& during the severity of the winter, in a great measure to her bed. But her sufferings are upon the whole less than they used to be, & she endures her privations with resignation—& unless when she has a recurrence of a bilious attack, she reads a good deal, & is in mind active and cheerful.

We have another cause of sorrow in our house, which is the state of my poor Daughter's health—her appetite has gradually failed for several years—& a consequent weakness has superinduced a spinal complaint, which has subjected her to severe courses of bleeding & blistering, which you will be grieved to hear, have not yet produced for us steady hopes of her recovery. During our stay in London, we have been in frequent consultation about her cure, with a kind medical friend Dr Holland—& we [hope] she will have as much benefit from the best advice as can be had without her being actually seen by the Persons consulted. If it should be in our power to have her brought to London, that will be done, but at present she cannot bear such a journey.—You will be much concerned to hear that our excellent friend Mr Southey & his family

¹ James Wood, Dean of Ely, Master of St. John's from 1815 to 1839.

² The portrait was by Henry William Pickersgill and had been completed in 1832.

have been suffering from a severe domestic affliction. Symptoms of mental derangement appeared in Mrs S. last autumn.—She was removed to the Retreat at York¹—but there appears to be little hopes of her final recovery—& her husband is about to take her back to Keswick.

The business which brought me to London arose out of a hope of procuring some respectable situation for my Son W^m² from Sir R^t Peel's Government—& in this I should have had no doubt of succeeding, if the present administration could have kept their ground. But the Whigs have behaved more dishonorably than any great Party ever did. The consequence will be, the displacing of the only Men who are able to have deferred, at least for some time, a general convulsion. The Whig Lords will & must take the alarm, but it will be too late to save either themselves or their constitutional opponents.

A Copy of the Mss of Coleridge which you possess, would be welcome to his Executor Mr Green, I have no doubt; & with a view of having it conveyed to him, I request you would be so kind as to enclose it as follow—First a cover to — Green Esq, Surgeon Lincolns Inn fields—to whom you will please to signify, how it was given to you—& that I had requested you to forward it to him. This packet enclose to "Henry Taylor Esqre" & again enclose "to The Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office, London." The Book upon Mona which you kindly offer I should be glad to receive.³ When you should have an opportunity to send it to Liverpool, If you direct it to John Botton Esq^r for Mr Wordsworth Rydal—It will not be long before it will reach me by some parcel of his to his residence on Windermere. I have ordered my forthcoming little volume to be sent to you through the Bookseller at Ruthen—it will be out in about a fortnight.⁴

You will recollect Mr Fleming of Rayrigg, formerly of St John's he died suddenly about 3 months since, & not in good circumstances.⁵

¹ On October 2, 1834 (cf. E. Dowden, *Life of Southey*, London, 1882, p. 180).

² The matter had been preoccupying Wordsworth for some time. In January, 1835, he wrote to Lord Lonsdale and offered to resign the office of Stamp Distributor, if his son could succeed him (W. Knight, *Life of William Wordsworth*, iii. 244).

³ Presumably A. Llwyd, *A History of the Island of Mona, or Anglesey*, published in 1833. In the catalogue for the sale of Wordsworth's library in 1859 it is No. 133.

⁴ Wordsworth wrote "fortnight."

⁵ Rev. John Fleming, B.A., 1789, rector of Bootle, from 1814 to 1835. He died January 11, 1835. Wordsworth interested himself in the family of his old friend and tried to help them (cf. *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, ed. W. Knight, iii. 69).

My Son John is still at Workington, where he holds the Living for his Brother in Law—but he will soon have to fall back upon his Vicarage at Brigham¹—he is building a house which will cost not much less than £1000—£400 of which is contributed by the Patron & the Building Society. In the volume about to appear you will find a Sonnet beginning "Pastor & Patriot" upon the building of his house—I think he has had a Son born since you heard from us last—who, tho' an uncommonly fine Child when we saw him, at about a month or six weeks old, has since been a great sufferer, together with his Mother—from Influenza & Low fever—& the Child has been reduced to a state of weakness which has caused much anxiety to the Parents—he is however beginning, we hear, to gather strength. John seems to think that the situation of the Rectory at Workington is not favorable to health—being low & contiguous to marshy ground—so that we shall be glad of the change, when his family retire to the banks of the Derwent.

My wife joins me in every good wish to yourself & Sisters—Had I not now been so long absent, we had some of us meditated² paying you a visit this summer—as it is, we must hope to be spared to meet at some more distant time—unless you can muster courage—should you have leisure—to come to see us at Rydal.

Believe me my dear Friend to remain
faithfully & affectionately yours

W^m Wordsworth

I regret not having a frank—but I shall not wait for one thinking you would rather pay postage than that I sh^d do so.

[Endorsed:]

The Rev^d Rob^t Jones
Plas yn Llan
near Ruthin
N.W.

¹ In the diocese of Carlisle, five miles from Workington. John Wordsworth was married on October 11, 1830, to Isabella Curwen (cf. E. de Selincourt, *Dorothy Wordsworth*, Oxford, 1933, p. 385).

² Wordsworth wrote "mediatated."

THE NOCTES AMBROSIANÆ, AND JAMES HOGG

BY ALAN LANG STROUT

IN February, 1835, appeared the seventy-first and concluding number of the *Noctes Ambrosianæ*, perhaps the most popular of serial publication before *Pickwick Papers*. If Scott's *Lay of the Last Minstrel* and succeeding poems increased the post-horse duty in Scotland, so anxious were readers to visit the scenes depicted by the author, if the receipts of the dining-room of the Athenæum Club fell off some three hundred pounds when Theodore Hook's well-known seat in "Temperance Corner" became vacant, is it any wonder that the famous *Noctes of Maga* enabled Ambrose to move from Gabriel's Road to Picardy Place in 1826, and *Blackwood's Magazine*, even when the Whigs came into power, to flourish like the green bay tree?

Dickens's *Bleak House* presents vivid depictions of Leigh Hunt and Walter Savage Landor; Disraeli's novels contain thinly disguised portraits of his contemporaries; Peacock's works have as one of their charms the delightful presentation of Shelley, Coleridge, Byron, and others, but John Wilson's characterization in the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* of James Hogg, an imaginative re-creation of an actual living person, extending over more than a dozen years, is, as far as I know, unique in English literature.

A writer of fiction has the task of making his characters seem human; Wilson had the task, on the contrary, of making a human being seem fictitious. Only once, in one of the early *Noctes*, does he, perhaps, attempt anything approaching subtlety in his characterization of the Ettrick Shepherd. Here, towards the close of the number of April, 1824, after Hogg has had his pocket picked of his watch, he exclaims, "I niffered wi' Baldy Bracken, in the Grass-market, the day before yesterday, and she didna lose a minute in the twenty-four." This fine representation of a peasant's superstition shows, for a moment, a flash of psychological insight that Wilson, in his fury of composition, never took the trouble to attain

again. But if his character lacks subtlety, it has vigour and gusto to atone. Hogg and the shower-bath, Hogg's suffering from the "janndice"—"I was feared to wash my face, lest the water grew ochre,"—Hogg's cure for rheumatism, Hogg at the theatre in London, Hogg blowing soap-bubbles at the age of eight—"the maist poetical epok perhaps in the life o' a great untaucht original genius"—such passages prove (on however low a level) the dictum of De la Croix that "Art is exaggeration in the right place." Consider, too, the Shepherd's inherent honesty, apropos of mock-turtle soup :

I hate a' things mock—soops, pearls, fawse tails, baith bustles and queues, wigs, cawves, religion, freenship, love, glass-een, rouge on the face o' a woman, no exceppin' even cork legs, for timmer anes are far better, there bein' nae attempt at deception. . . .

Or take his various definitions : of gluttony, of wit, of a "sumph," even of the weather :

Gluttony may be defined "an immoral and unintellectual abandonment o' the sowl o' man to his gustative natur."

Wut is a sayin' at ance felt by the auditor to be baith apt and new—givin' rise in his mind to wonner that he hadna thocht o' sayin't himsell, sorrow that he didna say't, and general conviction that to hae said it was ayont his power.

A Sumph, Timothy, is a chiel to whom Natur has denied any considerable share o' understaunin', without hae'n chose to mak him altogether an indisputable idiot. . . . His puir pawrents hae'na the comfort o' being able, without frequent misgivings, to consider him a natural-born fule, for you see he can be taucht the letters o' the alphabet, and even to read wee bits o' short words, no in write but in prent, sae that he may in a limited sense be even something o' a scholar. . . .

Weather, sir, aiblins no to speak very scientifically in the way o' meteorological observation—but rather in a poetical, that is, religious spirit—may be defined, I jalouse, "the expression o' the fluctuations and modifications o' feeling in the heart o' the heevens, made audible, and visible, and tangible on their face and bosom." That's weather.

Or note his low opinion of literary men :

They canna shute, they canna fish, they canna loup, they canna warsle, they canna soom, they canna put the stane, they canna fling the hammer, they canna even drive a gig, they canna kiss a lassie in an aff-haun and pleasant manner, without offendin' her feelins . . . and what's perhaps the maist contemptible o' a', they canna, to ony effect, drink whusky.

Similar excerpts might be quoted by the dozen without exhausting the wealth of the *Noctes Ambrosianæ*.

One wishes, too, to quote in full Hogg's palming himself off, in one of his happiest moments, as the editor of *Blackwood's Magazine*, or his swimming with Tickler off Portobello, or his seeking shelter with North, Tickler, and De Quincey in the arbour of Buchanan Lodge when the Newfoundland puppy O'Bronte swallows opium and oversets the beehives. One wishes to include enough of the other scenes to give the full flavour of the Ettrick Shepherd's personality—his conviction that "Toryism is an innate principle o' human nature—Whiggism but an evil habit"; his joy in food, particularly in oysters: "There's a wee ane awa' down my wrang throat, but de'il a' fears, it'll find its way into the stamach"; his sympathy for all creation, as when he says of another batch of oysters that they are "aneuch to create an appeeteet in the palate o' yon Atomy swingin' in Dr. Munro's class in the College by himsell during the lang vacation—puir fallow!"; his extraordinary confidences: "As for mysel' I never wear drawers, but hae my breeks lined wi' flannen a' the year through; and as for thae wee short corded under-shirts that clasp you like ivy, I never had ane o' them on syn last July, when I was forced to cut it aff my back and breast wi' a pair o' sheep-shears, after having tried in vain to get out o't every morning for twa month." Such a passage shows why Mrs. Hogg dreaded the appearance of a number of *Maga* containing a *Noctes*. No wonder that Hogg himself sometimes grumbled, though he secretly delighted in his notoriety. "I'm satisfied," complacently observes the Shepherd in the last but one of the *Noctes*, "I'm satisfied to be the Scottish Theocritus."

Since, however, it is impossible to include all the purple patches of John Wilson, I propose in the pages that follow to discuss, in some detail, the characterization of the Ettrick Shepherd in the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* between 1822 and 1835; and then, very briefly, to compare this fictitious creation with the real James Hogg.

A.—THE SHEPHERD OF THE "NOCTES"

Perhaps the chief difference between the Hogg of real life and the fictitious Shepherd of *Blackwood's Magazine* lies in the apparent omniscience of the latter. This omniscience closely connects itself with what constitutes one of the principal charms of the *Noctes Ambrosianæ*, the spontaneity of the dialogue, the naturalness with

which the conversation passes, chameleon-like, from one topic to another. If Wilson is to keep the interest alive, if he is to give contemporary questions an original twist that will lighten the serious discussions, necessarily he must have Hogg, along with the other speakers, constantly give his opinion on some subject or constantly ask questions about some other. It follows that his range of interests is amazing. In the twenty-fourth *Noctes* of February, 1826, the Shepherd exclaims to North and Tickler :

Here I am ready to dispute wi' you on ony subject, sacred or profane. I'll cowp you baith, ane after the ither. What sall it be ? History, Philosophy, Theology, Poetry, Political Economy, Oratory, Criticism, Jurisprudence, Agriculture, Commerce, Manufactures, Establishments in Church and State, Cookery, Chemistry, Mathematics—or My Magazine ?

A more ambitious writer than I might add to the list just quoted or develop each of the topics in turn ; but I shall rest content to consider : (1) Hogg's general knowledge, including politics and science ; (2) his knowledge of English literature ; (3) his knowledge of the classics.

1. Hogg's General Knowledge

(a) *Politics*.—In his life and writings the real James Hogg discloses no trace of Burns's social bitterness, and in the *Noctes*, naturally enough, the Shepherd shows himself, in politics, a firm Tory. "I like their Toryism," writes Hartley Coleridge of the *Noctes*, "because it is of the old, hearty, cavalier, fox-hunting, beef and port kidney, such as Ben, and Shakspeare, and Dick Corbet (pride of the *lawn*), would have chimed in with. Tories of the *Ambrosial* sect understood that in order to be a gentleman it is necessary to be a *man*."

The *Ambrosial* Shepherd mentions Lord North and Pitt and Fox ; he mentions Canning and Sir James Graham and Lord Darlington ; he mentions Lord Eldon, and Mr. Sadler, and Lord Chandos, and Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Durham, and Stanley, and Lord Melbourne, and Lord John Russell, and "Lord Althropp" [Althorp], and "Yearl Grey." He shows an acquaintance with the Irish oratory of Sheil, whom he dislikes, and of Charles Phillips, whom he admires. He ridicules as man and speaker "Hairy Cobren" or "Cowburn," one of the leading Whig lawyers of Edinburgh,

who later became Lord Cockburn; Jeffrey as orator "pits me in mind o' a mouse cheepin." He has a low opinion of Sydney Smith, "perpetually playin' upon words," and considers Macaulay "an impertinent puppy" on one page and "the cross-bred puppy o' a mongrel-cur" on the next. He detests O'Connell and "Bristol" Hunt and "Josey" Hume. He detests also, though far less consistently, one of the most bilgily bespattered victims of *Maga*, Henry Brougham, "lion-ape," "infuriated demagogue," "sulkiest creature that ever growled," whose "rabid rhodomontade," "poisonous slaver," and "cool, rancorous, deliberate impudence" receive constant castigation by North and Tickler, curiously mixed, however, with alternate laudation, from the fact that pride in Brougham the Scotsman necessarily triumphs at times over detestation of Brougham the Whig. Thus in the sixty-sixth *Noctes* of July, 1834, Hogg quotes, with satiric comment, a couple of sentences from one of Brougham's speeches. Yet in December of the same year he confides to North, "Me and Hairy Brumm's great freens, and baitin' yoursell, sir, he's the grandest companion I ken, either in a mixed company o' ordinar dimensions, or at a twa-haun' crack." The two passages are characteristic; in truth, by judicious quotation one can prove Wilson to have been the friend or enemy of practically every man in his generation.

(b) *Science*.—"James," says Christopher North in a sunny mood, "you are extremely well informed on most subjects. Indeed, out of pure science, I do not know one on which you are ignorant." North hardly takes into account his friend's knowledge of natural history, to say nothing of the general scientific information he possesses. Thus the Shepherd refers to Sir Humphry Davy's preservatives against dry-rot; he knows the physical law relating velocity to the squares of the distances; he appears generally acquainted with the speed with which light travels from the sun; he executes on the ice the forty-seventh proposition of Euclid, and even mentions hydrostatics, though in connection with sugar and whisky. Moreover, he considers Dr. Brewster "a real clever man," praises Dr. Chalmers' *Astronomical Discourses*, refers on one occasion to the ocular spectrum, and says on another, "The refraction and reflection o' light's a beautifu' mystery, and I wush I understood the sceance o' optics." Just as part of the fun lies in bestowing upon Hogg this miscellaneous information, so equally amusing is his ignorance at times in comparison with his superior

knowledge at others. For example, not only does he refer, poetically, to "the Planetary System, from Venus wi' her cestus to Saturn wi' his ring," but he speaks on one occasion also of a change in "the ellipse o' the earth—I suspect about the ecliptic"; yet in October, 1829, he shows ignorance both of *nebulæ* and of binary systems and admits that North's discussion of astronomical matters gives him "a desperate headache." Again, he more than once expresses a high opinion of Newton. Yet in July, 1827, he agrees with Sir Richard Phillips "in thinkin' Sir Isaac Newton out o' his reckonin' entirely about gravitation! There's na sic law as a law o' gravitation. What would be the use o't? Wull ony body tell me, that an apple or a stane wudna fa' to the grun' without sic a law? Sumphs that say sae! They fa' to the grun' because they're heavy."

"Natural history," remarks the Shepherd in January, 1827, "is just another name for Natural Theology—and the sang o' the laverock, and the plumage o' the goldfinch—do they not alike remind us o' God?" Six months later he moralizes similarly; ". . . Ay, ae sic minnut o' Natur's book's worth fifty volumms o' prentit prose and poetry, and micht weel require a giftet and a pious commentator." Any number of Hogg's glowing, rhetorical descriptions of nature might be quoted; no doubt they gave to the contemporary reader as much pleasure as anything in the *Noctes*. But to me Wilson's purple patches seem happiest when they combine his humour with his rhetoric, and instead of presenting any of his lush rhapsodies on nature I shall illustrate this humour, merely advising the serious-minded reader, who may feel "Pumas, or Crocodiles, or Krakens, or ony ither carnivorous cannibals" beneath his dignity, or who may object to the pastoral image that English love songs are "cauld and clear as the drap at a man's nose on a frosty mornin'," or who may dislike the Shepherd's flippancy in answering Tickler's inquiry as to how the country looks, "Green as a cameleon could desire"—advising such readers to skip the next few pages.

A passage at the end of one of the early *Noctes*, that of September, 1825, admirably illustrates Hogg's touchiness and may serve as our single example of his knowledge of the botanical. The Shepherd starts the second stanza of a song he is singing:

We never paddled in the burn
Nor pull'd the gowan droll—

Odohertry. The gowan droll ! What is there droll about a gowan ? The gowan fine, you mean.

Hogg. Sir Morgan Odohertry, if ye be Sir Morgan, ye'll hae the goodness to make sangs for yersell, and no for me. It was, nae doubt, "gowans fine," in Burns, for he wanted it for a rhyme to "Auld langsyne." Now I want to rhyme to "bowl," a word far different. And besides, the gowan is a droll-like sort of crater as ye wad see in a field.

Odohertry. I beg your pardon. Proceed, Shepherd.

Hogg's interest in the animal creation extends from the goose to the laughing hyena and the American sea-serpent. "Taeds [toads]," he once remarks, "is the only leevin cretur I canna thole." Of a particularly fine prize goose consumed at the *Noctes* of December, 1829, he remarks :

What a strapper ! Puir chiel, I wudna hae kent him, sae changed is he frae the time I last saw him at the Manse, takin' a walk in the cool o' the Saturday e'ning, wi' his wife and family, and ever and anon gabblin' to himsell in a sort o' undertone, no unlike a minister rehearsin' his sermon for the comin' Sabbath.

After the bird has been eaten, he suggests that "The skeleton maun be sent to the College Museum, to staun at the fit o' the elephant, the rhinocerus, and the cammyleopardawlis." And in August, 1834, he proposes sending the bones of a recently devoured hare to the naturalist James Wilson : "We'll swear that we fand it embedded in a solid rock, and it'll pass for the young o' some species o' antediluvian yelephant."

Naturally the Shepherd has much to say of dogs also. In August, 1830, he gives the following reminiscence of his dog Hector :

It's a gude sign o' a dowg, sirs, when his face grows like his master's. . . . Hector got sae like me, afore he deed, that I remember, when I was owre lazy to gang till the kirk, I used to send him to tak my place in the pew, and the minister never kent the difference. Indeed, he ance asked me neist day what I thocht o' the sermon ; for he saw me wonnerfu' attentive amang a rather sleepy congregation. Hector and me gied ane anither sic a look, and I was feared Mr. Paton wud hae observed it ; but he was a simple, primitive, unsuspectin' auld man—a very Nathaniel without guile, and jaloused naething ; though baith Hector and me was like to split, and the dowg, after lauchin' in his sleeve for mair nor a hundred yards, could staun't nae langer, but was obliged to loup awa owre a hedge into a potawtoe field, pretending to hae scented partridges.

In this same number he paints also a vivid picture, entirely serious, of the death of one of his dogs by hydrophobia. But instead of this grim passage I shall quote a reference to dogs of four years later.

The *Noctes* of August and November, 1834, have their scene laid at Altrive. In the first of these numbers, when Tickler shows some nervousness at the Shepherd's half-dozen dogs, present at meal-time, his host reassures him thus :

I ken, Mr. Tickler, ye dinnae like dowgs. But ye needna be feared, for nane o' them's got the hydrophoby—accepp it may be Fang. The cretur's been varra snappish sin' the barommeter reached ninety—and bat a goslin' that began to bark—but though the goslin' bat him again, he hasna yet been heard to quack ony, sae he's nae muckle mad. You're no mad, Fang ?

Fang. Buy-wuy-wuy.

Shepherd. His speech's rathey affackit. He used to say—bow-wow-wow.

Tickler (*sidling away nearer the Shepherd*). I don't much like his looks.

Again one is tempted to prolong these quotations indefinitely. But disregarding the Shepherd's philosophizing on the love of cats and his explanation of why the ass's bray has no echo, and merely pointing out in passing that despite his general sympathy for animals his Toryism necessarily makes him intolerant of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, at least as regards fox-hunting, I shall limit myself to one more passage only, his story of his escape from a mermaid. The following example of marine biology, worthy of Baron Munchausen, combining humour with sparkling descriptive power, has always seemed to me one of the very happiest passages in the *Noctes Ambrosianæ*, worthy of coupling with Wilson's three greatest flights, Hogg's adventure with the bonassus, Hogg's adventure in the eagle's nest, and Hogg's metempsychosis into the soul of a lion.

As Tickler and the Shepherd are swimming off Portobello in July, 1827, the conversation turns to mermaids. Says the Shepherd :

I was ance lyin' half asleep in a sea-shore cave o' the Isle o' Sky, wearied out by the verra beauty o' the moonlicht that had keepit lyin' for hours in ae lang line o' harmless fire, stretching leagues and leagues to the rim o' the ocean. Nae sound, but a bit faint, dim plash-plash-plash o' the tide—whether ebbin' or flawin' I ken not—no against, but upon the weedy sides o' the cave. . . . A' the hail warld was forgotten—and my ain name—and what I was—and where I had come frae—and why I was lyin' there—nor was I ony thing but a Leevin' Dream. . . .

Something—like a caulder breath o' moonlicht—fell on my face and breast, and seemed to touch all my body and my limbs. But it canna be mere moonlicht, thocht I, for, at the same time, there was the whisperin'—or say rather, the waverin' o' the voice—no along the green cave wa's,

but close intil my ear, and then within my verra breast; sae, at first, for the soun' was saft and sweet, and wi' a touch o' plaintive wildness in't no unlike the strain o' an Aeolian harp, I was rather surprised than feared, and maist thocht it was but the wark o' my ain fancy, afore she yielded to the dwawm o' that solitary sleep. . . .

I opened my een, that had only been half steekit—and may we never reach the shore again, if there was not I, sir, in the embrace o' a Mermaid!

Tickler. James, remember we are well out to Inchkeith. If you please, no—

Shepherd. I would scorn to be droon'd with a lee in my mouth, sir. It is quite true that the hair o' the cretur is green—and it's as slimy as it's green—slimy and sliddery as the seaweed that cheats your unsteady footing on the rocks. Then what een!—oh, what een! Like the boiled een o' a cod's head and shouthers!—and yet expression in them—an expression o' love and fondness, that would hae garred an Eskimaw scunner. . . . Oh dear, dear me!—hech, sirs! hech, sir! the fishiness o' that kiss! I had hung my claes to dry on a peak o' the cliff—for it was ane o' thae lang midsummer nights, when the sea air itself fans ye wi' as warm a sugh as that frae a lady's fan, when you're sittin' side by side wi' her in an arbour. . . . Sae that I was as naked as either you or me, Mr. Tickler, at this blessed moment—and whan I felt myself enveloped in the hauns, paws, fins, scales, tail, and maw o' the mermaid o' a monster, I grued till the verra roof o' the cave let down drap, drap, drap on us—me and the Mermaid—and I gied mysel up for lost.

Tickler. Worse than Venus and Adonis, my dear Shepherd.

Shepherd. I began mutterin' the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, and the hundred and nineteenth psalm—but a' wudna do. The Mermaid held the grup—and while I was splutterin' out her kisses, and convulsed waur than I ever was under the warst nightmare that ever sat on my stamach, wi' a desperate wallop we baith gaed tapsalteerie—frae ae sliddery ledge to anither—till, we accelerated velocity, like twa stanes, increasin' accordin' to the squares o' the distances, we played plunge like porpusses into the sea, a thousand fadom deep—and hoo I gat rid o' the briny beastliness nae man kens till this day; for there was I sittin' in the cave, chitterin' like a drookit cock, and nae Mermaid to be seen or heard; although, wad ye believe me, the cave had the smell o' crabs and labsters, and oysters, and skate, and fish in general, aneuch to turn the stamach o' a whale or a sea-lion.

2. *Hogg's Knowledge of English Literature*

On November 6, 1813, Scott wrote to Byron:

The author of the *Queen's Wake* will be delighted with your approbation. He is a wonderful creature for his opportunities, which were far inferior to those of the generality of Scottish peasants. Burns, for instance—not that their extent of talents is to be compared for an instant—

had an education not much worse than the sons of many gentlemen in Scotland. But Hogg literally could neither spell nor write grammar. When I first knew him, he used to send me his poetry, and was both indignant and horrified when I pointed out to him parallel passages in authors whom he had never read, but whom all the world would have sworn he had copied.

In his later life—even though, according to R. P. Gillies, one of his crotchets was that wide reading destroyed originality—Hogg no doubt repaired to some extent the deficiencies of his earlier. Yet contemporary literary discussion bored him, if we may trust a delightful passage from his own *Domestic Manners of Sir Walter Scott* of 1834 :

The only time ever his [Scott's] conversation was to me perfectly uninteresting, was with Mr. John Murray, of Albemarle Street, London. Their whole conversation was about noblemen, parliamenters, and literary men of all grades, none of which I had ever heard of or cared about ; but every one of which Mr. Murray seemed to know, with all their characters, society, and propensities.

This information Sir Walter seemed to drink in with as much zest as I did his whisky toddy, and this conversation was carried on for two days and two nights, with the exception of a few sleeping hours ; and there I sat beside them, all the while, like a perfect stump : a sheep who never got in a word, not even a bleat. I wish I had the same opportunity again.

Such a passage, with its curious mixture of self-sufficiency and modesty and its naïve exaggeration, might have come from the mouth of Wilson's Shepherd in the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* quite as naturally as from the pen of the real James Hogg.

There is really no reason, of course, why North or Tickler, or De Quincey, or James Ballantyne, or Macrabin, or Cyril Thornton, or Buller, or Seward, or any speaker, including Jeffrey, introduced into the *Noctes Ambrosianæ*, might not express all or nearly all of the opinions on literature put into the mouth of the Ettrick Shepherd, Wilson's mouthpiece, one of the jugglers who keeps the ball of conversation in the air. Yet even if Hogg's estimates of books or authors lacked the quaintness or naïveté or startling originality of many of his opinions on other subjects, they would still impress a reader by their extraordinary range. Here in particular, one feels, the fictitious creation surpasses the human Shepherd.

(a) *Prose*.—The Shepherd's conversation in the *Noctes* abounds in general literary allusions, even if we disregard his more than three hundred references to poetry, to be considered presently. He

mentions Brobdignag and Lilliput. He mentions Alexander's and Belshazzar's feasts. As he dangles a particularly fine oyster over the mouth of North he cries, "Open sesame." He compares the moon seen through the mist to "ane o' Ossian's ghosts"; he speaks of Robin-good-fellows and "horrible stories o' Black Familiars" and "the spirit that saluted De Gama at the Cape o' Storms"; he alludes to such superstitions as the water-kelpie on the waterhorse, the seven sleepers, and the wild huntsman; he alludes also to the fable of the goat and the well. He mentions the country of Cockayne, and Prester John, and "the time o' Tubal-Cain," and Saladin, and the Great Khan o' Tartary, and Robin Hood, Little John, Adam Bell, Clym o' the Clough, and William o' Cloudelee, and "Michael Scott, in the olden time," and Sir William Wallace, and William Tell, and Lorenzo the Magnificent. At a disturbance at one of the *Noctes* he exclaims, "Some Guy Fawkes has gotten intil the cellerage"; on another occasion he refers to the death of Edward the Second in Berkeley Castle. When the talk falls upon the Marquis of Montrose he explains, "I never read Clarendon; but for a' that, I ken weel the details o' the dismal story; they're weel gien by my frien Robert Chambers." He shows himself agog for information also: "Did Cadwallar, Urien, Lewellen, Modred, and Hoel flourish afore or after Ossian?"

Sometimes, to be sure, the Shepherd displays a reassuring ignorance. He confuses, for example, Edmund Burke with Burke the murderer. And when De Quincey quotes a passage from one of Thomas More's colloquies, Hogg interrupts him by saying, "That, I fear, 's Utopian."

Opium-Eater. Not the less characteristic, on that account, Mr. Hogg, of Sir Thomas More.

Shepherd. Eh?

To make up for such lapses, the Shepherd knows at least the names of "auld Roger" and of "Francie" Bacon. He quotes "auld Burton, in his Anatomy," who "ca's hare a melancholy meat." He mentions Bunyan, and shows familiarity with Thomas Parr of Restoration times; he philosophizes, sympathetically, upon Nell Gwynne; extraordinarily, also, he proves his acquaintance with the American Cotton Mather. Again, he refers to Chesterfield; he shows that he knows Blair's *Sermons*; he mentions "Mr. Gibbons o' the Decline and Fa'" and "the famous Dr. Johnston

that wrote the Rammler"; he speaks of "Mrs. Thrawl, that is, Peeosy"; and he interrupts one of De Quincey's speeches with the somewhat embarrassing query, "Didna Adam Smith say something like that, sir?" Again, he quotes Pierce Egan and mentions Dr. Syntax, considers Mrs. Radcliffe "a true genius," and calls Dr. Parr "an auld pedant," a rather unkind remark after his personal association with the doctor in *The Last Day of the Tent*, September, 1819. Interestingly, moreover, Wilson presents the masculine Hogg, who admires Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*, as feeling a very low opinion for "sic a meeserable deevil as Lowry Sterne":

"A puny, sickly sensibility there is," he informs North in January, 1831, "which is averse frae all the realities o' life. . . . Wha was Sterne? As shallow a sentimentalist as ever grat—or rather tried to greet. O, sir! but it's a degrawdin' sicht to humanity, yon—to see the shufflin' sinner tryin' to bring the tears intill his een, by rubbin' his lids wi' the pint o' his pen, or wi' the feathers on the shank, and when it a' winna do, takin' refuge in a blank, sae —, or hidin' his head amang a set o' asterisks, sae ****; or boltin' aff the printed page a'thegither, and disappearin' in a black blotch!"

Similarly, the plain-speaking Shepherd has no very high opinion (nor, indeed, had Wilson) of Sheridan's comedies or of Sheridan the man. He considers "Peezarro" "a' naething but flummery" and says, "I canna thole to hear sic a sot as Sherry aye classed wi' Pitt and Burke."

His range in contemporary literature is equally great. He asks North's opinion of Grattan's *Highways and Byways* and of Knowles's *Lectures on Poetry*; he mentions Charles M'Kenzie's *Notes on Hayti*, advertised by Colman: "I'll warrant they'll be gude . . ."; he has even read the architect Smeaton's contemporary account of the Eddystone Lighthouse. If he refers satirically to the "Cockney" Hazlitt's "character of Shakspeare" and scoffs at *The History of Scotland*, in three volumes, by William Ritchie of *The Scotsman*, he compliments, sometimes in a fairly extended passage, sometimes in passing mention, Crofton Croker's *Fairy Legends of Ireland*; Southey's *Life of Kirk White*; Hood's *Whims and Oddities*; that "delichtfu' wark o' my auld freen Mrs. Grant [of Laggan's] *Letters from the Mountains*; Lardner's *Pocket Cyclopaedia* and Bowring's *Poetry of the Magyars*; such Quakers as the Howitts, Scott of Amwell, "wha wrott some simplish things in a perseverin' speerit o' earnestness," Wilkinson, Bernard Barton, and Wiffen; such

annual and periodical animalculi as Pringle, Malcolm, and Hetherington; and the ladies in general from Miss Mitford to Maria Jane Jewsbury and Mrs. Jameson, except, of course, Lady Morgan, victim too of the *Quarterly*. He affirms that he loves Dr. Morehead, and in refuting De Quincey's general charge of "odious disputativeness" against the Scotch, he enthusiastically commends such local celebrities as Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Thomson, and Dr. Gordon, just as he elsewhere praises "clever men" like the preachers Chalmers and Somerville. Naturally he praises such contributors to *Blackwood's Magazine* as "Delta" Moir, Thomas Aird, and the Modern Pythagorean [Dr. Robert Macnish], just as he praises, with ludicrous insistence, his own *Three Perils of Man*.

Naturally, also, he praises various contemporary novelists. Most of these are Scotch, but in July, 1834, he applauds Marryat's *Peter Simple* ecstatically: "Did he—did Marryyacht write Peter Simple? Peter Simple in his ain way's as gude's Parson Adams. . . . He that imagined Peter Simple's a Sea-Fieldin'." In his *Reminiscences of Former Days* Hogg himself writes, "I like Galt's writings exceedingly," and in the *Noctes* the Shepherd asserts that he prefers Galt's depiction of the Covenanters in *Ringan Gilhaize* to Scott's. He knows also the author's *Entail* and compliments his *Laurie Todd*. Though he is "aften unco coarse," says this model of refinement condescendingly, "Galt's genius is great." The Shepherd happily sums up Walter Scott's character in two words when he refers to his "gracious humanity." Of Scott's novels he mentions *Old Mortality*, *St. Ronan's Well*, *Redgauntlet*, and *Chronicles of the Canongate*; considers *Quentin Durward* "clean afore Peveril—ay, and Needgell too"; and calls *The Bride of Lammermoor* "the best, the only tragedy since Shakspeare." Among other novelists he praises Lady Charlotte Bury's *The Exclusives*, considers Picken's *Mary Ogilvie* "verra affeckin'," and couples Mrs. Johnstone's *Clan Albin* with Miss Ferrier's *Marriage and Inheritance*, which latter he says he first thought were written by Scott. Amusingly he expresses a dislike for Wilson's *Lights and Shadows of Scottish Life* on one or two occasions, the joke being, of course, that Wilson can afford sly raillery directed against himself, since he takes care to sprinkle plenty of compliments for himself in the *Noctes*, as elsewhere in *Maga*, for he thoroughly recognized the value of puffing.

One of North's most startling suggestions in the *Noctes* is that

Hogg should review for *Maga* the fashionable novels of high life.¹ In November, 1826, the Shepherd had confided to Christopher that

Some o' thae late Lunnon stories garred me scunner. There's Treman, that Lockhart or some ither clever chield praises in the Quarterly—and there's Mawtildy, and there's Graunby, and there's Brambleberry Hoose, and there's the Death Fetch and Carry,² and some dizzen others, whase teetles I hae forgotten—no worth, a' o' them pitten thegither, any ae volumn of my Winter Evening's Tales, that nae reviewer but yoursel', Mr. North, (and here's to ye in a bumper,) ever either abused or pane-gaireezed—because, forsooth, they are not "Novels of Fashionable Life."

Upon North's proposal in March, 1829, Hogg replies that he has read both *Pelham* and *The Disowned*, by Bulwer, and considers them good, but goes on to express contempt for the *genre* :

. . . These leddies and gentlemen in fashionable novels as well as in fashionable life, are aye intrig—trig—triguin'—this leddy with that ane's gentleman, and this gentleman with that ane's leddy—then it's a' foun' out thro' letters or keyholes, and there's a duel, and a divorce, and a death, the perpetual repetition o' which, I confess, gets unco wearisome. Or the chief chiel in the wark is devoted to cairts and dice—and out of ae hell—as they rightly ca' gamblin'-houses—intill anither—till feenally, as was lang ago foreseen, he blaws out his brains wi' a horse-pistol, a bit o' the skull stickin' in the ceilin'. . . .

In November, 1831, Hogg praises "Bullmer," *i.e.* Bulwer, again :

Bullmer's a clever chiel—and, in ma opinion, describes fashionable life the best o' a' the Lunneners.

North. Except the author of Granby.

Shepherd. I hae never read the Marquis o' Granby. Sen' him oot to the Forest.

It will be noted that here the Shepherd expresses ignorance of Lister's *Granby*, which he had included in his list of November, 1826. As a matter of fact, he elsewhere says of the fashionable novels, "I never read nane."

(b) *Poetry*.—In November, 1828, when North hints that some "creatures" actually exist who consider the *Noctes* indelicate, Hogg bursts out :

¹ In July, 1826, North asks Hogg to review Mrs. Radcliffe's *Posthumous Works* in four volumes, and in the same number the Shepherd hints his willingness to submit an article on Allan Cunningham's *Songs of Scotland*. A year later, North remarks that he wishes Hogg would write the Monthly Dramatic Review for the magazine.

² "Novels of 1826—Tremaine, by Ward; Matilda, by Lord Normanby; Granby, by Lyster [Lister]; Brambletye House, by Horace Smith; The Death Fetch, by Barim": R. Shelton Mackenzie's note.

Indelicate indeed ! at that rate wha's delicate in the hail range o' English leetature ? Is Addison delicate, wha left " no line which dying he would wish to blot " ? . . . Let the Castle o' Indolence be inserted in the Index Expurgatorius, on account o' that stanza about the silly maiden " waxing very weakly as she warms " in the arms of the losel. . . . What say they to the description o' Adam and Eve in the garden o' Eden—to Dido and Æneas in the cave—to Tasso and Ariosto, and——

Such a passage sufficiently indicates the extent of the *Noctean* Shepherd's acquaintance with English poetry. Besides at least sixty-five allusions to the Bible and an equal number of references to or quotations from the plays of Shakespeare, he actually quotes (or recognizes or fills in quotations by others) as follows : Milton, thirty-seven times ; Burns, some thirty times ; Wordsworth, fifteen times (not to mention a passage from the *Preface*) ; Campbell, twelve times ; Thomson and Gray, nine times each ; Pope, seven times ; Cowper, six times ; Coleridge, Byron, and Hogg, four times each ; Addison, W. J. Mickle, and Allan Ramsay, three times each ; Southey, two times ; and one each by the following : " auld Crowe " [William Crowe], Allan Cunningham, Dryden, Dyer, Jane Elliot, " a Mr. Ewan of Aberdeen," Goldsmith, " auld Herbert," Anne Home, Lyttelton, John Mayne, Hector Macneill, William Roscoe, Scott, Francis Semple, Spenser, Suckling, Tennant, Kirk White, and Young. Nor have I included three quotations from Scottish songs, three quotations from the ballads *Chevy Chace* and *Sir Patrick Spens*, two quotations from the song " Back and side go bare," besides " an auld Scotch rhyme," and three or four " auld proverbs " in prose.

To pause only on one poet, the Shepherd's knowledge of *Paradise Lost* is really extraordinary : thirty of his thirty-seven quotations from Milton come from this masterpiece. His enthusiasm, as well as his startling intimacy with Milton, appears in such a passage as the following : " Galileo and Milton met at Florence, or somewhere else in Tuscany. I wush I had been o' the pairty, and had got a keek through the Italian's telescope." On North's referring to the " dismal universal hiss " that meets Satan upon his return to hell, the Shepherd exclaims, " Gran' is the passage—and out o' a' bounds magnificent, ayont ony ither imagination o' a' the sons o' men." Altogether we are prepared for the dictum of January, 1835 : " The shooblimest o' a' poems, though a silly shepherd say sae, assuredly is *Paradise Lost*. The blin' bard was a seraph."

Here Hogg simply says what Wilson himself had said at the conclusion of his *Hour's Talk about Poetry* in *Blackwood's Magazine* of September, 1831, and what he carries over to the article of the same title in the *Recreations of Christopher North* of 1842.

Not all the allusions, of course, are serious. When North in November, 1828, happens to refer to his housekeeper, "To my amazement Shoosy was in tears—absolutely sobbing—and covering her white face with her apron. 'Then cheered I my fair spouse, and she was cheered' [*Paradise Lost*, 5. 129]," the Shepherd cries, "What! Hae you married your housekeeper? Is Shoosy your spouse?" Several of the quotations from Shakespeare, also, indicate a certain flippancy. In October of the same year, referring to North, the Shepherd quotes from *Hamlet* :

"So froon'd he aince, when in angry parle
He smote the sliding Pollock on the ice."

Whereupon Ambrose says, "You allude, sir, to that day at the curling on Duddington Loch." In December of the same year in an amusing scene typical of the high jinks of the *Noctes* Hogg incautiously sticks a haggis which Ambrose has just placed on the table, the contents overflow, and Tickler seeks shelter on the mantel and North and the Shepherd on the back of a chair. Hogg finds consolation in a quotation from *Hamlet* and a reference to *Richard III*. "Noo, Awmrose, and a' ye waiters, make your escape, and leave us to our fate. . . . What for do you look so meeserable, Mr. Tickler? Death is common—'tis but 'passing through Natur' to Eternity'! And yet—to be drooned in haggis'll be waur than Clarence's dream!" On still another occasion Hogg rather spoils the effect of a quotation by referring in connection with it to "Mrs. Hamlet." And finally, I regret to admit that one of the allusions to the Bible shows the Shepherd's more carnal nature: Nell Gwynne's bosom reminds him of the Song of Solomon.

To the quotations just considered could be added dozens of references by the Shepherd to English poetry and poets, particularly to his contemporaries. He speaks of "the auld idiots that wrote the original Henry Fifts, King Johns, and so forth"; he says he has never read the Romances of Chivalry, with the exception of Blind Harry's *Sir William Wallace*; on one occasion he addresses Tickler as "you auld Archimawgo." He refers to Collins' *Ode on the Passions*, to Smollett's *Leven Water*, to James Graham's

Sabbath, to Scott's *Marmion*, to Byron's *Mazeppa*. He mentions Bloomfield, and Gifford, and "Barry Cornwall," and Allan Cunningham, and even David Lester Richardson. He puns on Pollok's *Course of Time*; he considers the worst fifty lines of his own *Queen Hynde* worth the whole of Campbell's *Theodric*; he shows sympathy for Shelley; he expresses contempt for Atherstone. "The very devil," he says, "is dull in the hands of Robert Montgomery." He praises Merivale, and James Montgomery, and Stoddart, and Lord William Spencer, and Laidlaw's *Lucy's Flittin'*, and Lockhart's *Spanish Ballads*. His low opinion, as poets, of Richard West, Chatterton, Beattie, Michael Bruce, Kirk White, and Keats, expressed in March, 1829, results perhaps from his special contention at the moment that no great poet dies young. Of William Lisle Bowles he says, "Lisle Bolls is a poet o' real genius. I never could thole a sonnet till I read his," and of Tom Moore, "Whatever may be the fate o' Lalla Rookh, his sangs'll last to a' eternity." He defends *Don Juan* in the early numbers and praises Byron superlatively, just as he consistently praises Southey, and, somewhat less consistently, Coleridge and Scott.

Since the Hogg of real life had or fancied that he had personal reasons for disliking Wordsworth, anything that the Shepherd utters against the poet in the *Noctes* has dramatic appropriateness. "Shakspear will say as muckle in four lines, as Wudsworth will say in forty," he grumbles in October, 1823, and in March, 1825, "Me and Wordsworth are aboon the age we live in—it's no worthy o' us." He satirizes *The Idiot Boy*, and, with crude humour, the poet's "auld leechgatherer," but his particular abomination is *The Excursion*:

. . . I houp there's mony an incident in the Excursion that I hae forgotten, for I cannot say that I recollect ony incident at all in the hail poem, but the Pedlar refusing to tak a tumbler o' gin and water with the Solitary. That did mak a deep impression on my memory, for I thocht it a most rude and heartless thing to decline drinking with a gentleman in his ain house; but I hope it was not true, and that the whole is a malignant invention of Mr. Wordsworth.

In the consideration of Hogg and the classics which immediately follows I shall point out inconsistencies, serious or amusing, in Wilson's writing. Various contradictions regarding the Shepherd's knowledge of English poetry might be given here also. Two examples only will suffice. Although he may be excused for not

recognizing a quotation from the *Ode to Duty* on one occasion, it is a little hard to forgive the Shepherd's failure to recognize a stanza from the poet's *Yarrow Visited*, since this was the poem Wordsworth had sent the real James Hogg, in November, 1814, for the *Poetic Mirror*.

In conclusion, the Shepherd's gallantry may be emphasized, in the consistent praise he bestows upon his female contemporaries: Mrs. Hemans, "L. E. L.," Mary Ann Browne, Mrs. Norton, and Joanna Baillie. In November, 1828, he refers to "that dear delightfu' creter, Mrs. Hemans," in rhetorical fashion. In March, 1829, he calls "L. E. L." "a delighfu' cretur" also, and asserts that Joanna Baillie in her *Plays on the Passions*

has a' the vigor o' a man, and a' the delicacy o' a woman. And oh, sirs! but her lyrics are gems, and she wears them gracefully, like diamond-draps danglin' frae the ears o' Melpomene. The very warst play she ever wrote is better than the best o' any ither body's that hasna kickt the bucket.

(The passage admirably illustrates the Scotch worship that Maginn hit off in July, 1822, when he wrote in his *Metricum Symposium Ambrosianum* in *Maga*, "Here's to Shakspeare in Petticoats, noble Joanna." Four years earlier, in August, 1818, Wilson himself had thundered that Joanna Baillie's plays "probably approach as near to Shakspeare as Southey to Spenser, Wordsworth to Milton, Scott to Ariosto, Byron to Dante"—a statement that the stunned reader may accept, though hardly in the sense that the writer meant it. In August, 1831, and January, 1836, also, Wilson couples Miss Baillie with Shakespeare.)

A good many writers on Hogg have quoted his pleasingly sentimental exclamation when he was introduced to Letitia Landon on his visit to London in 1832, "I didna think ye'd been sae bonnie! I've said many hard things aboot ye. I'll do sae nae mair. I didna think ye'd been sae bonnie!" The "hard things" did not appear in the *Noctes*. There the Shepherd's rhapsodical description of Mrs. Siddons as Lady Macbeth, April, 1827, is worth all the absurd compliments regarding other women in the series.

(To be concluded)

A NOTE ON THE "BAD QUARTOS" OF 2 AND 3 HENRY VI AND THE FOLIO TEXT

BY R. B. MCKERROW

IT seems at present to be agreed by the majority of Shakespearian scholars, though there are dissentients, that *The First Part of the Contention*, 1594, and *The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke*, 1595, are "reports"¹ of performances of plays substantially² identical with the *Second* and *Third Parts of Henry VI* as given in the Folio of 1623.

While, however, by far the greater part of the text of the two quartos differs more or less considerably, as we should expect a "report" to differ, from that of the Folio, which is thought to have been printed from the original manuscript of the play or a transcript of it, there are a certain number of passages in which the correspondence is so close that it seems impossible not to conclude that one text was copied from the other or that both were copied very exactly from the same original, and this not by "report" but by transcription.³

Consider, for example, the following passages :

1 (a) *The Contention*, 1594 (G1), scenes xvi., xvii. 1-7 :

Enter the Lord *Skayles* vpon the Tower
walles walking.

Enter three or foure Citizens below.

Lord Scayles. How now, is Iacke Cade slaine ?

1. *Citizen.* No my Lord, nor likely to be slaine,

¹ Whether by shorthand or otherwise is of no moment in the present discussion.

² In *R.E.S.* ix. 157 ff., 315, I argued that there was some evidence that the author of the form of 2 *Henry VI* reported in *The Contention* was not familiar with the succinct account of the descent of Richard Duke of York contained in the "Articles betwixt King Henrie and the Duke of Yorke" which is found in *Stow's Chronicles* [1580] and the 1587 edition of *Holinshed*, though not in the 1577 edition of the latter ; whereas in 2 *Henry VI* as printed in the Folio the genealogy is evidently based on these "Articles" ; the inference, of course, being that the play had been to some extent revised since its first performances. This does not, however, affect the identity of the versions of the play as a whole.

³ I include in "transcription" both copying by hand and setting up in type. Thus two texts set up from the same copy would be "transcripts" of the same original.

For they haue wonne the bridge,
Killing all those that withstand them.
The Lord Mayor craueth ayde of your honor from the Tower,
To defend the Citie from the Rebels.

Lord Scayles. Such aide as I can spare, you shall command,

G1^v But I am troubled here with them my selfe,
The Rebels haue attempted to win the Tower,
But get you to Smythfield and gather head,
And thither I will send you Mathew Goffe,
Fight for your King, your Country, and your liues,
And so farewell, for I must hence againe.

Exet omnes.

Enter *Iacke Cade* and the rest, and strikes his sword
vpon London stone.

Cade. Now is Mortemer Lord of this Citie,
And now sitting vpon London stone, We command,
That the first yeare of our raigne,
The pissing Cundit run nothing but red wine.
And now hence forward, it shall be treason
For any that calles me any otherwise then
Lord Mortemer.

1 (b) 2 Henry VI, IV. v., vi., 1-6 (*Folio text*):

*Enter Lord Scales vpon the Tower walking. Then enters
two or three Citizens below.*

Scales. How now? Is *Iacke Cade* slaine?

1. *Cit.* No my Lord, nor likely to be slaine:

For they haue wonne the Bridge,
Killing all those that withstand them:
The L. Maior craues ayd of your Honor from the Tower
To defend the City from the Rebels.

Scales. Such ayd as I can spare you shall command,
But I am troubled heere with them my selfe,
The Rebels haue assay'd to win the Tower.
But get you to Smithfield, and gather head,
And thither I will send you *Mathew Goffe*.
Fight for your King, your Countrey, and your Liues,
And so farwell, for I must hence againe. *Exeunt.*

*Enter Iacke Cade and the rest, and strikes his
staffe on London stone.*

Cade. Now is *Mortimer* Lord of this City,
And heere sitting vpon London Stone,
I charge and command, that of the Cities cost
The pissing Conduit run nothing but Claret Wine
This first yeare of our raigne.
And now henceforward it shall be Treason for any,
That calles me other then Lord *Mortimer*.

In these passages note particularly the similar division into lines, which as the speeches are not metrical can hardly have come about by chance.¹

2 (a) *The True Tragedie*, 1595 (D5), scene xv., lines 1-18 :

Enter *Warwike* and *Oxford*, with souldiers.

War. Trust me my Lords all hitherto goes well,
The common people by numbers swarm to vs,
But see where *Sommerset* and *Clarence* comes,
Speake suddenlie my Lords, are we all friends ?

Clar. Feare not that my Lord.

War. Then gentle *Clarence* welcome vnto *Warwike*
And welcome *Sommerset*, I hold it cowardise,
To rest mistrustfull where a noble hart,
Hath pawnde an open hand in signe of loue,
Else might I thinke that *Clarence*, *Edwards* brother,
Were but a fained friend to our proceedings,
But welcome sweet *Clarence* my daughter shalbe thine.
And now what rests but in nights couerture,
Thy brother being careleslie encamp't,
His souldiers lurking in the towne about,
And but attended by a simple garde,
We maie surprise and take him at our pleasure.
Our skouts haue found the aduenture verie easie,

2 (b) 3 *Hen. VI*, IV. ii., 1-18 (Folio text) :

Enter *Warwicke* and *Oxford* in England,
with French Souldiors.

Warw. Trust me, my Lord, all hitherto goes well,
The common people by numbers swarme to vs.

Enter *Clarence* and *Somerset*.

But see where *Somerset* and *Clarence* comes :
Speake suddenly, my Lords, are wee all friends ?

Clar. Feare not that, my Lord.

Warw. Then gentle *Clarence*, welcome vnto *Warwicke*,
And welcome *Somerset* : I hold it cowardize,
To rest mistrustfull, where a Noble Heart
Hath pawn'd an open Hand, in signe of Loue ;
Else might I thinke, that *Clarence*, *Edwards* Brother,
Were but a fained friend to our proceedings :
But welcome sweet *Clarence*, my Daughter shall be thine.
And now, what rests ? but in Nights Couerture,

¹ Another pair of closely parallel passages will be found at the end of the "miracle" scene (2 *Hen. VI*, II. i. 118-153). Here, however, though we find similarities in line division, e.g. ll. 135-7, the Folio makes an attempt to divide up Duke Humphrey's longest speech into verse.

Thy Brother being carelessly encamp'd,
His Souldiors lurking in the Towne about,
And but attended by a simple Guard,
Wee may surprize and take him at our pleasure,
Our Scouts haue found the aduenture very easie :

In these two passages note particularly the use in both texts of "comes" in l. 3, and of "town" in the singular in l. 15 where most editors from Theobald onwards have felt it necessary to emend to "towns."

Now such pairs of similar passages seem to have bothered the maintainers of the "report" theory, for they have felt it necessary to explain how the reporter can have got hold of a few isolated passages of good text for incorporation into his report. Thus Professor Peter Alexander says :¹

But the copy for the Quarto [*The First Part of the Contention*] does not everywhere consist of reported matter ; it is occasionally based on transcription.

He then instances the Lord Scales passage quoted above, and after throwing out a casual suggestion to which I shall refer later,² proceeds :

The compilers of the Quarto had here a manuscript at their disposal, and it cannot have consisted merely of actors' parts : the stage directions also correspond ; and this is found elsewhere. [Several other cases of correspondence in the two texts are here given.]

Sir Edmund Chambers³ rejects the idea of a fragmentary transcript, and suggests an alternative explanation of the agreement :

I do not see any evidence for a fragmentary transcript, or know why any such document should come into existence. Conceivably the reporter had the short "part" of the Citizen.

Dr. W. J. Lawrence,⁴ referring to the same phenomenon, says :

Improbable almost to the verge of impossibility as it sounds, I am compelled by the logic of the situation to conclude that in most cases the adapter⁵ had access to the prompt copy. Not otherwise can we account for the curious identity of passages in a piracy and its prototype, passages not only having the same wording, but the same capitalisation, the same italicisation and the same punctuation. Seeing that the piracy was always the first to get into print, coincidences of the sort are truly remarkable.

¹ *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III*, 1929, pp. 82-4.

² See p. 68, note 2.

³ *William Shakespeare*, i. 283.

⁴ *Those Nut-Cracking Elizabethans*, 1935, p. 160.

⁵ Dr. Lawrence is referring to the compilers of the "Bad Quartos" as a whole.

I need not lay stress on the difficulties attending any of these views, on the improbability of the reporter being in possession of pieces of a transcript which, while being only scraps from here and there, consisted of complete, if short, passages, which were moreover written, contrary to the practice in most play manuscripts, only on one side of the paper,¹ while the supposition of the preservation of an actor's part will only explain one or two pairs of similar passages out of several. Lastly, the idea of a "pirate" having access to the prompt copy seems on the face of it most improbable, as, indeed, Dr. Lawrence admits—and if he had access to it, why bother with a "report" at all, why not simply transcribe the whole thing?

Is not the truth that the scholars who think it necessary to seek out such difficult explanations as these are unconsciously guilty of an assumption for which there is no ground whatever, namely that because the passages under discussion appear in what is on the whole a "good" text, these passages are themselves good? It is, however, surely evident that a text which is good as a whole may, and often does, contain passages which owing to defect or illegibility in the copy from which it was made do not represent that copy as it originally stood. There is no reason whatever for thinking that because the Folio text as a whole is evidently much better than that of the *Contention* and *True Tragedy*, it is therefore good *throughout*.

Once, however, we abandon the assumption that if a passage appears in a "good" text as well as in a "bad" one it is necessarily a good passage and belongs to the MS. from which the good text as a whole was derived, a much simpler explanation presents itself, namely that in these pairs of similar passages the "good" MS. happened to be defective or illegible and the printer (or editor) of the "good" edition was therefore compelled to follow the "bad" one!²

Suppose that the printer or editors of the First Folio were persons of reasonable intelligence and conscientiousness—qualities which, so far as I know, we have no right to deny them—how should we expect them to go about their task? Certain plays existed in reasonably good quartos, and these they would simply reprint, with perhaps a certain amount of revision by the light of nature.

¹ Otherwise we should have found the parallel passages occurring in pairs, representing the recto and verso of the leaves.

² Professor Alexander does seem to glance in passing at this possibility, to the extent at least of the quartos being referred to in setting the Folio, but he does not develop the idea further (*op. cit.*, p. 84).

They would doubtless unearth from the theatre's library or store-chest all the MSS. of Shakespeare's plays that they could discover. Some, presumably the more recent ones, perhaps more carefully treated after their author became a person of consequence, might be in good condition, others, either older or more (or less carefully) used, might be defective. In the case of two plays, *Merry Wives* and *Two Gentlemen*, they were able to procure fair copies made perhaps by a professional scribe for some classically minded amateur or patron.¹ In the case of *The Winter's Tale* there was evidently some difficulty in getting a copy at all, and when one, an unusually good one, was found, its place in the volume had been passed and special arrangements had to be made to fit it in.²

But there would seem to have been a few plays of which the MSS. were imperfect or in part illegible. One, *Richard III*, had at one time been defective, but had been made good by the insertion of several pages transcribed from the quarto of 1605.³ Lastly, there were, I think, probably some MSS. in various degrees of decay. Perhaps some were so bad that no use could be made of them at all and they had simply to be discarded and are now lost, but there were, I think, two plays in somewhat bad condition of which imperfect texts had been printed years before, namely 2 and 3 *Henry VI*. Obviously the best, indeed, the only thing to do with these was to print the MSS. so far as possible and to make them good where necessary from the old quartos. Many years before, a similar thing had been done in the case of *Romeo and Juliet*, the "good" quarto of which had evidently been partly made up from the "bad" one. Why this should have been necessary at so early a date as 1599 is far from clear, as one would have supposed that a good MS. of a play written not more than at the most nine or more probably five years before, and apparently popular, would still have been available, but it is undoubtedly the case that a considerable part of Act 1⁴ as well

¹ The abnormal grouping of all the entries at the head of each scene on the system usual in classical plays, which is found in these two, as well as certain other peculiarities such as the regularity in the speaker's names, seem to indicate that they were printed from fair copies and not from author's MSS.

² See Pollard, *Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos*, p. 135, and Willoughby, *The Printing of the First Folio*, pp. 16, 18, 24.

³ Namely III. i. 1-c. 168, and from about v. iii. 48 to the end. There is, I think, reason for believing that the MS. had been made good at a comparatively early date, perhaps for a revival, and that it was not simply completed from the quarto in 1623 when required for the Folio; but the question is too complicated to discuss here.

⁴ According to Dr. Greg, sheet B of Q1 only. See his *Principles of Emendation*, British Academy Lecture, 1928, pp. 19, 50. I think, however, that scattered

as small portions elsewhere was taken over by the "good" quarto from the "bad" one.¹ Exactly the same thing was, I believe, done by the Folio in the case of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*: the MS. was printed so far as it went, but when defective it was made good from the "bad" quartos. These similar passages that have given so much trouble are thus easily accounted for. They are not "good" bits of text that appear mysteriously in "bad" quartos, but "bad" bits that were taken over into the "good" quartos simply because the MS. from which these were printed happened to be, in these particular places, defective.

We need not, of course, assume that the use of a bad text to fill up the gaps in a good one would necessarily mean that the bad text would be *exactly* reproduced. There can be little doubt that the Elizabethans did not share the modern reverence for every jot and tittle of an author's manuscript. If a man had to see a friend's work through the press, especially if that friend was dead, he would, I am sure, have felt that he was doing him or his memory a good turn if he made in his text such alterations as he considered his friend would have made had he been present. He might, indeed, use even more than normal liberty in such corrections if the text available to him was notoriously bad. We should, therefore, not be at all surprised if we find these scraps of bad quarto text inserted into the Folio somewhat tidied up, punctuation and metre improved and occasionally a better word substituted,² while it is even possible that occasionally an editor might have drawn on his memory of performances of the play and have included from this source actors' additions for which there was no authority in the original MS. Furthermore, I believe that when recourse was had to a "bad" quarto it was only used so far as necessary, and that whoever, printer or editor, was in charge of the formation of the text took trouble to take from the MS. whatever was legible. Thus we may

through the rest of the play, e.g. at II. ii. 16-22; III. iii. 15-36, 47-71, 82-98; IV. i. 1-16, 34-41, etc., there are passages too similar in Q1 and Q2 for us to assume that one is merely a report, unless some reason can be shown for their being much more accurately reported than the bulk of the text.

¹ Does not a similar explanation hold good in the case of *Hamlet* I. i. 58-79, where, as was first, I think, noted by Professor Dover Wilson in "The Copy for 'Hamlet,' 1603," in *The Library*, 3rd Series, ix. 164-5, the texts of Q1 and Q2 are so closely alike in spelling and punctuation, as well as in wording, that it seems impossible that they can be independent? It seems most probable that here also the text of a second quarto was completed from a bad first.

² The variation of "staffe" for "sword" in the stage-direction in the passage on p. 65 above is curious. According to the *Chronicles* it should be "sword," and Cade *had* a sword (cf. IV. x. 28, 52).

find a patch of text identical in the quarto and Folio preceded and followed by a portion not exactly the same, but yet showing much more similarity than the general run of the text, suggesting damage to the MS. which had left a portion partly legible above and below the lines which had disappeared entirely. See, for example, the last part of 1 (*a*), above, which exhibits several differences in the texts due possibly to one or both the causes mentioned, though the Q.—F. resemblance as a whole, and in particular the printing of "That the (This) first yeare of our raigne" as a separate line, seems to indicate without doubt that use was made of the quarto.

It may be asked whether, when portions of the bad quartos were used in setting up the Folio text of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, the actual printed text was used as copy or whether this was transcribed and the transcripts inserted into the MS.¹ The question is one which is perhaps hardly capable of settlement, but I suspect that in some cases at least the actual printed text was corrected and used for the compositor to work from. In other cases it may have been simply consulted and corrections or additions from it have been written into the MS.

This point is not, however, in any case of much practical importance. What *is* of importance is the question of the relationship of the texts, for if the view set forward here is correct, namely that when the quarto and Folio texts coincide exactly, they coincide in bad text and not in good, it must make a great deal of difference in the attitude of the textual critic towards these passages. If we have two texts of a play, one of which has been derived through the report of a performance and the other by transcription from the author's MS., it would seem at first sight as if any reading in which these agree must almost certainly be genuine, for the chance of texts independently transmitted by two entirely different methods agreeing in errors would be negligible. Editors seem, therefore, generally to have felt that a reading of the "good" text supported by the "bad" one is unassailable. But we must evidently differentiate. When we find a passage in the "good" text the *sense* of which is identical with that of the corresponding passage of the

¹ I quoted the quartos from the earliest editions, as in these passages the editions of 1594(5), 1600, and 1619 correspond very closely, and allowing for the minor emendations of the Folio editor or printer, it is difficult to be certain which was used. In the case of the 3 *Henry VI* one can, I think, say with some confidence that for v. vii., the whole of which seems to have been printed from the quarto, it is probable that the text of 1595 was used with a few slight editorial corrections.

"bad," though the wording differs, we can still, I think, say that the sense must be that intended by the author; but where the *wording* is identical we must consider whether we have not merely a case of the "good" text here following the "bad," for if so we have only *one* text and not two independent texts, and that text one which may be no more than quite inaccurate "report." The verbal coincidence of the two texts may therefore mean not that the reading is almost certainly correct, but that it is actually more likely to be in error, being derived from a "bad" text, than other readings of the "good" text which have not the apparent support of the "bad" one.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

THE SITE OF DIODATI'S HOUSE

PROFESSOR W. S. CLARK¹ may be interested to have some additional information which has come within my knowledge, regarding the situation of Diodati's house. While it is not possible to give its exact position, yet there is every indication that the learned professor lived within the precincts of Geneva.

To begin with, it may be pointed out that it was only those who lived in retirement who had houses in the country outside the city, such as Emily of Nassau, Princess of Portugal, who had withdrawn from a troubled life to the refuge of Geneva, and who acquired the Château de Prangins² as well as a house in the rue Verdaine,³ which she occupied with her six daughters. A similar course was adopted by Agrippa d'Aubigné, who lived in the Château du Crest⁴ in the summer, but during the winter at Geneva, in his wife's house in the Bourg-le-Four quarter, nearly opposite the site of the former Burgundian Castle. But these were persons living, as was said, in semi or total retirement; for those who played an important part in the life of the city, such as Giovanni Diodati, to have a residence some distance away from the work upon which they were engaged would appear unreasonable. The following data shed an illuminating light upon the problem.

A little-known book, entitled *Lettres trouvées. Pages historiques sur un épisode de la vie de Jean Diodati*,⁵ relates how certain treasonable anonymous letters, seemingly indicating a threatened attack on Geneva, were found in November or early December, 1621, by a servant of the Sieur Le Double, on the Degrés de poule.⁶ These letters, so the *Registres du Conseil* inform us, were taken by Le

¹ See his article on "Milton and the Villa Diodati," *R.E.S.*, January, 1935.

² In the country north of Geneva.

³ A street running from the rue de Rive to the Bourg-le-Four, parallel with the city walls and close to Calvin's college.

⁴ In the commune of Jussy, ten kilometres from Geneva.

⁵ Published by Ph. Plan, Geneva, 1864.

⁶ A stairway made in 1554, behind the apse of the Cathedral.

Double to Diodati "en sa maison," "entre 9 et 10 heures avant midi." Moreover, on that very day, Agrippa d'Aubigné returned from a visit he had paid to Berne¹ and, at two o'clock in the afternoon, Diodati called upon him to ask his opinion about the letters.² The fact that Le Double, an inhabitant of Geneva, was able to go to Diodati's house between nine and ten in the morning is undeniable proof in support of our contention. But better follows. The *Registres* continue that "ce soir mesmes, [Diodati] retournant de chez M. d'Aubigné avec M. Chabray, sur les neuf heures du soir . . ." Now, according to the rules of the city as established by the Reformed Church,³ Genevans were not allowed out in the streets after nine o'clock; is it therefore conceivable that Diodati, a respectable citizen and theologian, would, at nine o'clock, when he was supposed to be at home, set forth on a journey to a villa on the shores of Lake Lemman? The same book yields further confirmation of the matter under consideration: ". . . le lendemain, sortant pour se rendre au presche & rencontrant M. Chabray sous la hale . . ." ⁴ On the next day, he was indisposed, "ne pouvant sortir du logis," and a day or two later "il attendit patiemment en sa maison." ⁵

Again, all the members of the learned society in which Diodati moved lived in the Ville Haute section of Geneva, in one or other of the streets around St. Peter's Cathedral or near Calvin's college. Here was Théodore Tronchin, here Benedict Turretini, fellow-preachers with Diodati in Geneva; here lived Agrippa d'Aubigné from 1620 to 1630. We know the situation of d'Aubigné's houses: when he first came to Geneva, after riding wildly for his life through hostile France, he lodged with the Sieur de Pellissari, but soon rented in the rue Verdaine a house that belonged to the syndic Jean Sarrazin, the same house which Emily of Nassau would acquire in 1626. Here d'Aubigné remained until his marriage in 1623 to Renée Burlamacchi, when he moved to a house close by. Now, d'Aubigné became an intimate friend of Diodati very shortly after his arrival in Geneva,⁶ at the same time as he made the acquaintance of Tron-

¹ M. Armand Garnier has proved, independently of the present passage, that d'Aubigné paid two visits to Berne, and not one, as has so far been thought, the first being in November, 1621. See his *Agrippa d'Aubigné et le Parti protestant*, Paris, 1928, T. iii., p. 127.

² D'Aubigné was then living near the Cathedral.

³ Cf. Archives de Genève, Nouveau recueil de réglemens, 22 février, 1536.

⁴ *Lettres trouvées*, p. 10.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁶ He almost certainly knew Diodati before 1620, as the latter had come on a mission in 1614 to a district in France near d'Aubigné's home.

chin, Turretini, and others. Diodati was an honoured member of the small and select society forming the Genevan intelligentsia, into which d'Aubigné was at once not merely admitted but welcomed because of his learning and experience.

A piece of indirect evidence on the situation of Diodati's residence is to be found in a relation of the circumstances attendant on the death, in 1629, of the Princess of Portugal. Théophile Heyer, writing for the *Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève*,¹ quotes these words from the *Registres du Conseil* ²:

Ont été choisis pour conseillers aux princesses de Portugal les seigneurs Guaict et Du Puys, syndiques, Anjorant et Bitri, conseillers, et spectables Jehan Deodati, Théodore Tronchin et Benedict Turretin, pasteurs en ceste Eglise. . .³

In the next volume of the *Mémoires* of the Society ⁴ Heyer inserts a copy of Emily of Nassau's will, in which we find that Diodati was one of the witnesses.⁵ Would a man living in the country be chosen to fulfil these duties, and, if he were chosen, would he be able to perform them?

J. A. Gautier, in his monumental *Histoire de Genève*, speaking of the case of Nicolas Anthoine,⁶ says that Anthoine first came to Geneva in 1624. After this, he travelled for some time, then returned to Geneva, where

il disputa avec beaucoup d'approbation la chaire de philosophie, entra en qualité de précepteur dans la maison du professeur Diodati, où il se conduisit sans reproche.⁷

Such cumulative testimony seems to show conclusively that Diodati did live within the city walls. The actual situation of the house itself cannot be found, but there is a decided likelihood that it was a house "assize en la rue devant le Temple de Saint-Pierre,"⁸ and for the following reason. The house in question

¹ *Mémoires de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève*, 1^{re} série, T. xv., p. 172.

² He has explained that the Princess's daughters had requested that advisers should be appointed for them, now that their mother was dead.

³ *Registres*, 1629, fo. 51, 21 mars.

⁴ *Mémoires*, 1^{re} série, T. xvi., pp. 462-7.

⁵ "Le tout, scellé et cacheté, fut déposé le même jour, 22 février 1629, entre les mains du notaire en présence de Pierre Guaict et Pierre Dupuis, syndics, Jacob Anjorant, conseiller, Jean Diodati, Benedict Turretin, Théodore Tronchin, pasteurs, et Timothée Perrot, hôte-pastier."

⁶ Anthoine became a Jew, and was put to a hideous death at Geneva in 1632.

⁷ *Histoire de Genève*, 1914, T. vii., p. 202.

⁸ See Th. Heyer, *Mémoires de la Société . . . Genève* [op. cit.], 1^{re} série,

was bought in 1550 by Laurent de Normandie, and "elle passa ensuite à la famille Diodati." Now, de Normandie died in 1569, of the plague,¹ leaving a widow and four sons. It has not been possible to discover when the house facing St. Peter's Cathedral passed out of the hands of the Normandie family, but the probability in favour of this being indeed the residence of Giovanni Diodati, where Milton visited him, is very strong, while to hold that he lived in a house on the Lake shore is clearly untenable.

SYLVIA L. ENGLAND.

DRYDEN'S EPILOGUE TO *THE RIVAL LADIES*,

1664

JOHN DRYDEN was not one lightly to forego a prologue or an epilogue. The opening of a new theatre, the revival of an old play, or the maiden effort of a budding playwright were equally a challenge to the exercise of his peculiar art. It is, therefore, strange that the absence of an epilogue to his second play, *The Rival Ladies*, should have passed almost without comment. Granted that the general character of this tragi-comedy promises little for its vanished epilogue, its omission is not without interest. It is a definite lacuna that confronts any bibliographer of the poet, and one that may perhaps have some biographical significance. This discussion is concerned with the reasons for its disappearance and the chances of its rediscovery.

That the censor was active would seem unlikely. The early years of the Restoration found a stage that was not politically conscious, save for its occasional expression of divine right. Nor was Dryden himself at the time inclined to challenge objection by personal satire. In short it is improbable that time will produce a quarto with the missing epilogue, as ultimately was forthcoming a copy of *The Prophetess*, with its censored political prologue. We must search elsewhere for the cause of its disappearance. The clue lies in the conditions of Dryden's career. Almost exclusively concerned as he was during the period of his apprenticeship with matters of literary form and prestige, he was not one consciously to provoke criticism: his funds of patronage were too dubious, his reputation

T. xvi., p. 406. According to a plan which Heyer constructed, this site is actually number 3 Place Saint-Pierre. This seems a most suitable position, in the light of the evidence given above.

¹ Cf. Archives de Genève, *Livre des Morts*, ix., p. 112.

insecure. The status of Dryden in the world of letters is indicated by the tone of his dedication to Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery: "Your favour," he remarked, "has shone upon me at a remote distance, without the least knowledge of my Person; and (like the Influence of the Heavenly Bodies) you have done good, without knowing to whom you did it." A subsequent passage indicates that, though the play had received the applause of Orrery in actual performance, the printed copy was forwarded to the latter in Ireland. It would not be surprising, therefore, to discover that the young poet, self-conscious under the eye of so notable an arbiter of the "new way of writing Scenes in Verse," had himself conveniently forgotten the epilogue, and for good artistic reasons. It may have seemed a work too slight, in his better judgment, to support the weight of Orrery's criticism, or again it may have seemed unduly apologetic, and, hence, to have lessened the value of the gift. Something of both will perhaps appear in the copy offered hereunder for consideration.

A manuscript purporting to be that of the missing epilogue is to be found in the Bodleian Library, in the same seventeenth-century hand, upon the same folio sheet as the authentic prologue, and immediately following it as though of one piece.¹ In kind it is identical with all of the epilogues to Dryden's early plays, with the possible exception of that to *The Indian Emperor*. The young playwright, until about 1668, appears to have been fearful of the race of critics who infested fops' corner, as well as of the ladies and "the great dons of wit." "So we, when once our play is done, make haste," he remarked, "with a short epilogue to close your taste."² To his first play, *The Wild Gallant*, he appended the plea that the wits shall "Now spare him, drown him when he comes again." In that to the same play, revived, he termed himself "a dull poet in despair to please." The epilogue to *The Tempest* found:

That sixty-seven's a very damning year,
For knaves abroad, and for ill poets here.

His epilogue to *An Evening's Love* knew that there was no mercy for a guilty muse. And to personify this apparent humility he quite often indulged in some witty device, as when in his prologue to *The Wild Gallant* he presented two astrologers who prognosticated the brief span of the play. So, as a close parallel the next year, this

¹ Ashmol. MS. 36, 37, fol. 267.

² Epilogue, *Sir Martin Mar-all* (produced 1667).

epilogue in question produced a doctor to diagnose the ill-health of the poet and his muse, by way of an urinal. But before proceeding further it may be well to glance at the piece. It is here reproduced unedited, as it appears in the Bodleian manuscript :

Epilogue by the Doctor

"Tis true, what as a iest our Poet meant,
His little witt was in y^e Prologue spent :
None left t'excuse my part, unles you would
Forbeare to damme it till t'were understood.
T'would go ill wth us, should you give o^r play
Halfe y^{ese} hard words y^{at} I gave you today.

The Dcōrs man comes—& brings in an Urinall
wth black water in it, & whispers y^e Dcōr in his Eare.

Whilst wee in vaine excuses wast our breath
The Poet & his Muse are sick to death ;
Hees past my cure : as his condicon stands,
I leave him in y^{ese} abler Doctors hands.

Examined critically as an epilogue to be attached to *The Rival Ladies*, this presents the immediate difficulty that there is no doctor in the play itself to administer hard words to the wits of the audience, though a sick man does appear in the keeping of two servants, who might by some stretch fulfil the function. The objection, however, is more easily removed when we recall that these incidental pieces were in general self-subsistent. No more had astrologers and Mercuries appeared in the plays to which they were attached. But more to the point is the coincidence of this epilogue with the attached prologue. If the latter is to be accepted, and it carries weight by being printed with the play, then the former would seem equally authentic, for the epilogue, unlike most of Dryden's, is in this instance closely linked to the earlier piece. Thus a couplet of the prologue enjoins its auditors to—

Expect no more, when once the Prologue's done ;
The wit is ended ere the play's begun.

Thence, in the first couplet of the epilogue, the speaker continues with hardly an interruption :

"Tis true, what as a iest our Poet meant,
His little witt was in y^e Prologue spent.

The next remark, "none left to excuse my part," is troublesome, however, unless we are to assume that it alludes to the actor's rôle

as speaker of the epilogue rather than that of doctor. In this case it would seem to follow that the same person had also recited the prologue. "Those hard words that I gave you today," then would refer to nothing in the play itself, but to the initial address where the wits had been variously compared to hangmen, maudlin lovers, and choleric losing gamesters. Though admittedly this is all conjecture, it does present the only plausible answer, and one, incidentally, that may perhaps be substantiated by an examination of the manuscript. There prologue and epilogue have all the appearance of being the actor's scrip, conceived and written out as a unit for a single person to memorize. That the actor changes costume for the finale constitutes no obstacle, for, as we have remarked, that was merely in accord with the tradition for some witty device with which to end the play. In fact this particular idea, not one of Dryden's more brilliant, was the relic of his preceding comedy, *The Wild Gallant*, wherein he had utilized the doctor's symbol of an urinal to indicate the ill-health of one of his characters.¹ Dryden was ever inclined to be thrifty of his ideas, and hence the mere change of costume by an actor would never have deflected him from repetition, if under pressure for an idea.

It would appear, therefore, that the epilogue might easily go with this particular play. What remains to demonstrate is the certainty of its authorship. Aside from the strict adherence that we have noticed to Dryden's early practice, one cannot but be struck by the many internal evidences of his style and ways of thought, weak as they may seem in this instance and short though the prologue be. For example, the first line, "Tis true, what as a iest our poet meant," is echoed a few years later by the first line of his "Epilogue on the Opening of the New House"; "Tho' what our Prologue said was sadly true." As to rhymes, we may grant that they are commonplace and answerable in half a dozen inferior poets of the time; nevertheless they are Dryden's as well. "Play" and "day" recur time and again throughout his prologues and epilogues, though there were other possible combinations that might have been utilized. "Death" and "breath" are almost inevitable in his heroic drama. The other rhymes are common enough. Rhyme and rhythm are his, if not the comparative enfeeblement of his wit; and even in the matter of wit is the following conclusion to one of his nearly contemporary prologues so much better or worse than the conclusion of the

¹ Act iv., s.d. "Enter Toby Coachman, with an Urinal."

epilogue? The two couplets are placed together for sake of comparison :

Would each man take but what he understands,
And leave the rest upon the poet's hands.¹
Hee's past my cure ; as his condicon stands,
I leave him to y^{ese} abler Doctors hands.

If by now it be not apparent that the epilogue is by Dryden and specifically that to *The Rival Ladies*, then, to quote from a character in *The Wild Gallant*,² " My Condition's desperate, and past thy Physick."

How the epilogue came to be misplaced from Dryden's works is another question. The safest hazard would be that the playwright was not unduly proud of his handiwork ; it was short and spiritless, particularly when sent up as a gift to Orrery, and the idea of it had already been utilized in an earlier comedy. Furthermore, the printer had brought the play to the bottom of a page. To print the ten-line epilogue would have required another gathering with some blank pages left over. Why not omit the thing altogether ?

ROSWELL G. HAM.

LAMB'S SAMUEL SALT AND MRS. MILMAN'S MR. S—TE

As every reader of Elia knows, two passages in the essay on the *Old Benchers of the Inner Temple*, as it was first published in the *London Magazine* for September 1821, had been suppressed when the essay was reissued in the volume of 1823. It is with the first of these suppressed passages that the present note is concerned.

In his portrait of Samuel Salt, his father's patron, referring to Salt's success with the ladies, Lamb had originally written this :

. . . He had a fine face and person, but wanted, methought, the spirit that should have shown them off with advantage to the women. His eye lacked lustre. Lady Mary Wortley Montague was an exception to her sex ; she says, in one of her letters, ' I wonder what the women see in S. I do not think him by any means handsome. To me he appears an extraordinary dull fellow, and to want common sense. Yet the fools are all sighing for him.'—Not so, thought Susan P— . . .

It was the reference to Lady Mary and the quotation from one

¹ Prologue, *The Indian Emperor*.

² Constance, Act IV.

of her letters that were cut out of the 1823 volume, where the same passage stands thus :

... He had a fine face and person, but wanted, methought, the spirit that should have shown them off with advantage to the women. His eye lacked lustre.—Not so, thought Susan P—— . . .

Lamb's reasons for deleting all reference to Lady Mary have not, so far as I know, been explained. I submit that they will be plain enough when the reference to Lady Mary's *Letters*, and what it implies, has been made clear.

To begin with, Lamb's editors do not seem to have been successful in tracing to its source his quotation from one of Lady Mary's letters. Mr. E. V. Lucas himself declares he has not found the passage.¹ But here, as in so many other cases, Lamb was both quoting from memory and allowing his fancy to disport itself with what he remembered. There actually is a passage in Lady Mary's *Letters During her Last Residence Abroad* which must be the source of Lamb's quotation. It is to be found in the letter of February 16, 1752. Her daughter, the Countess of Bute, had sent Lady Mary, who was then living at Lovere, in Lombardy, a "case of books"; among which were *Peregrine Pickle*, which had just come out, and Mrs. Milman's (*alias* Phillips) *Apology*,² published in 1748 and twice reissued in the next few months. Lady Mary, acting apparently on her daughter's advice, began her reading of the "case of books," on February 15, by Chapter LXXXI of *Peregrine Pickle*, those famous *Memoirs of a lady of Quality*, which Smollett had probably been paid to insert in his novel by their true author, Frances Anne, Viscountess Vane.³ The opening paragraph of her letter of February 16 contains her remarks on the *Memoirs* of Lady Vane. On the following day, that is on the morning of the 16th, Lady Mary picked up Mrs. Milman's (*alias* Phillips) *Apology*. This book, *An Apology for the Conduct of Mrs. Teresia Constantia Phillips*, being the life-history of another notorious woman of the times, Lady Mary was naturally led to draw a parallel between the careers and characters of the two *femmes galantes*, which parallel she begins in the last paragraph of the same letter of February 16, 1752. But she breaks off suddenly, thinking her daughter "heartily weary of" her "remarks," and ends her letter with a few lines on

¹ *Elia*, ed. Lucas, Methuen (Pocket Edition), p. 38.

² On Mrs. Phillips, Teresa Constantia (1709-1765), who had married a Dutch merchant whose name was Milman, see *D.N.B.*

³ On Lady Vane (1713-1788), see *D.N.B.*

one of Madame Constantia's lovers. This is, I think, the passage that had stuck in Lamb's memory. Here it is, such as Lamb must have read it in J. Dallaway's edition of *The Works of Lady M. W. Montagu*, published in 1803 and reissued several times in the following years :

. . . you must suffer me to say something of the polite Mr. S***, whose name I should never have guessed by the rapturous description his mistress makes of his person, having always looked upon him as one of the most disagreeable fellows about town, as odious in his outside as stupid in his conversation ; and I should as soon have expected to hear of his conquests at the head of an army, as among women ; yet he has been, it seems, the darling favourite of the most experienced of the sex, which shews me I am a very bad judge of merit. But I agree with Mrs. Phillips, that, however profligate she may have been, she is infinitely his superior in virtue. . . .

Though hardly one of the words ascribed by Lamb to Lady Mary is to be found in the above passage, all the ideas are there. *I wonder what the women see in S.* sums up the gist of Lady Mary's portrait of "the polite Mr. S." *I do not think him by any means handsome* is Lamb's rendering of her "odious in his outside" ; "stupid in his conversation" becomes Lamb's *an extraordinary dull fellow*. His *Yet the fools are all sighing for him* more or less corresponds to "yet he has been, it seems, the darling favourite of the most experienced of the sex."

On the whole, when reproducing from memory the passage about "the polite Mr. S***," Lamb softened Lady Mary's expressions. There is a possibility that this was due to contamination in his memory between this passage and another, earlier in the same letter, in which Lady Mary writes of a totally different person, namely of the Honourable Sewallis Shirley, who had married Lady Orford, another "lady of pleasure" whom Lady Mary had met, and pitied, at Florence¹ ; before his marriage Mr. Shirley had long been the lover of Lady Vane, who refers to him in her *Memoirs* as *Mr. S.* This is what Lady Mary says of the gentleman :

Mr. Shirley has had uncommon fortune in making the conquest of two such extraordinary ladies, equal in their heroic contempt of shame, and eminent above their sex, the one for beauty, and the other for wealth, both which attract the pursuit of mankind, and have been thrown into his arms with the same unlimited fondness. He appeared to me gentle, well-bred, well-shaped, and sensible ; but the charms of his face and eyes, which Lady Vane describes with so much warmth, were, I confess,

¹ See Lady Mary's letter to the Countess of Bute, dated *Louvere*, July 23, 1751.

always invisible to me, and the artificial part of his character very glaring, which I think her story shews in a strong light.

This passage at the end of the first paragraph of Lady Mary's letter of February 16, 1752, may very well have got confused in Lamb's mind with the passage at the end of the letter referring to "the polite Mr. S***" of Mrs. Milman's (*alias* Phillips) *Apology*, not merely on account of their general similarity—both being portraits of gentlemen who happen to be great successes with ladies of doubtful characters and whose faces Lady Mary does not like, but also from the fact that in her *Memoirs*, printed in *Peregrine Pickle*, Lady Vane referred to Mr. Shirley as *Mr. S.*, a fact which Lamb would probably remember.

So much for the source of Lamb's quotation from Lady's Mary's *Letters*.

Let us see now what may have been his reasons in 1823 for suppressing it.

Some people, of course, might think that, on referring to Lady Mary's *Letters* with the purpose of verifying his quotation, he was horrified to find such discrepancy between the words he had put in her mouth, or rather under her pen, and what she had actually written, and, afraid of being put to shame by some pedantic critic, suppressed the passage. But I do not believe in such scruples on his part and this for two reasons: first because he often took pleasure in altering other writers' words when it suited his purpose, and secondly because, if he had been afraid of pedantic criticism, nothing was easier than to quote Lady Mary *verbatim*. The passage on "the polite Mr. S.***" which I have given above, all of it except the last sentence, might have replaced the spurious quotation, and made perfect sense of Lamb's whole paragraph.

The suppression, I suppose, was due to his realizing or to some one pointing out to him that his fanciful and wholly unwarrantable identification of the Mr. S*** of Mrs. Milman's (*alias* Phillips) *Apology* with Samuel Salt could only prove most detrimental to the memory of one whom it had been his express purpose to endear to his readers. For the Mr. S*** of Mrs. Milman's (*alias* Phillips) *Apology*, by any one who has read her story, is sure to be remembered as a most despicable creature, one that fully deserves the condemnation Lady Mary passes upon him when she says that she fully agrees "with Mrs. Phillips, that, however profligate she may have been, she is infinitely his superior in virtue."

The *Mr. S**** of the *Apology*, I have just said. But as a matter of fact, there is no *Mr. S**** in it. There is only a *Mr. S—te*. Nor did Lady Mary, writing on the very day when she had met with the abbreviation of the gentleman's name in the pages of his victim's narrative, make any mistake about it: she had actually written *S^e*. But both J. Dallaway, in his edition of 1803, and again Lord Wharncliffe, in his edition of 1837, despite his professions of accuracy and his pretending to give a faithful reproduction of the original manuscripts, had replaced the *Mr. S^e* of Lady Mary by *Mr. S****. And it was left to W. Moy Thomas, the third or, rather, the fourth editor of her *Letters and Works*, to give in 1861 the true reading for the first time.

In her *Apology*, Mrs. Milman (*alias* Phillips) introduces *Mr. S—te*, the third lover she admits to have had, in the following terms:

. . . About this time she became acquainted with *Mr. S—te* . . . this led to a new Amour, which will take up some sheets in the Relation, and is interspersed with Circumstances of Distress . . . but could be too long a Digression here; therefore we propose to give it a Place in this work, where it shall interfere with nothing else; and our Readers will know it under the Title of the Amours of Tartuffe. (Vol. i, pp. 303-304.)

The "rapturous description" to which Lady Mary alludes is to be found in the opening pages of the History of Tartufe, which begins on p. 119 of the second volume. Here are one or two passages which explain Lady Mary's remarks:

. . . His Person is, without being handsome, agreeable; he is rather tall than middle-sized, but too much inclined to *Fat* to be called *well-shap'd*. There is something full of Meaning in his Eyes, which his Tongue has a most artful Way of explaining. His whole Figure together is graceful. He is clean, even to Female Delicacy; and has a very dangerous Address; dangerous we call it, because to every Purpose he would chuse to make Use of it, it's Insinuations are irresistible. (Vol. ii, p. 119.)

. . . Tartufe was too much a Master of every ruinous *Art* necessary to engage the Affections of the Fair, to fail of Success in any Enterprize of the amorous kind; and there was no Shape or Form but he could with ease assume that was likely to captivate that unwary sex. (*Ibid.*, p. 133.)

Who *Mr. S—te* was I have not been able so far to find out, though someone more familiar with contemporary gossip than I am may know. But that, whoever he was, he could not be identified with Samuel Salt is clear, and all lovers of Elia will, I feel sure, agree that Lamb did wisely in erasing any allusion that might have been traced to him from the *Old Benchers of the Inner Temple*.

G. A. BONNARD.

REVIEWS

The Early English Carols. Edited by RICHARD LEIGHTON GREENE. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1935. 10×6½ in. Pp. cxlv+461. 30s. net.

IN its own field of the early English lyric this is obviously a work of the first importance and one, so far as I can judge, for the execution of which there can be nothing but grateful admiration. It is planned as a complete corpus of English carols down to 1550, and is modelled on Child's monumental collection of English and Scottish ballads. Students of Middle English poetry, and, indeed, all readers of Chambers and Sidgwick's admirable little book of *Early English Lyrics*—now nearly thirty years old—must be aware of the importance of this particular form of verse and the merit of many of the examples that have survived; but they might be hard put to it to supply a definition. There is a common belief that a carol is essentially or originally a Christmas song, but though it is true that it is often related to the *noël*, the association is neither primitive nor profound. In Professor Greene's view—a view argued at length in his admirably documented introduction—a carol is such by virtue of its form: it consists of a series of stanzas preceded and followed, as well as separated, by a burden or refrain. This form is the natural outcome of the origin of the species, which arose out of the ring dance or *carole*, the burden representing the chorus sung over and over by the dancers, while the stanzas were interpolated—originally perhaps as improvisation—by the leader. How far the carol is a "popular" form of verse is partly at any rate a question of definition. Whether there are preserved any texts that actually owed their birth to a sort of communal inspiration of the sort described may perhaps be doubted; that many of those we possess were composed with a view to performance (if one may use the word) in the traditional manner—poems popular "by destination" if not "by origin"—seems at least probable; on the other hand, it is likely that most of those in the collection, and not necessarily the least attractive, are in fact rather literary exercises in a traditional

form, the origin of which, if not actually forgotten, had ceased to condition the composition. At least it is certain that earlier lyrics, such as the well-known verses "Of on that is so fayr and bright," were sometimes worked over into carol form. But that some more or less close connexion between the carol and the dance did in fact subsist and continue to vitalize production is perhaps suggested by the rather sudden disappearance of the kind about the middle of the sixteenth century.

There are, of course, various modifications of the form to be found in the extensive records of medieval and sixteenth-century literature, and not in every instance is the full strictness of structure maintained. The stanzas themselves are sometimes elaborated from the simple forms suggestive of an extempore origin. The refrain is sometimes wholly independent, but at others attaches itself to the several stanzas, and in so doing often modifies its wording. Indeed, it sometimes happens that the inter-stanzaic refrain differs from the initial, or that it differs from stanza to stanza, distinguishing itself from these only by its form or perhaps by its language; occasionally it is recognizable in the rime alone. Add to this the fact that having recorded the refrain at the beginning a scribe might not think it necessary to indicate its repetition after each stanza, and it will be seen that opinion may differ whether a particular poem should be classed as a carol or not. Nevertheless, readers of Chambers and Sidgwick's collection will probably be surprised to miss certain items from a comprehensive corpus such as the present. For instance, I fail to see the ground for excluding the charming lines

My ghostly fader, I me confesse,
First to God and then to you,

ascribed to Charles of Orleans (C. & S., xvii); or even the familiar "Back and side go bare, go bare" (C. & S., cxxxiii). Why should "She is gentle and also wise" appear, but not "She is so proper and so pure" (xlii)? Among others I look for in vain is one with the burden,

In youth, in age, both wealth and woe,
Auxilium meum a Domino (lxxxviii);

one beginning,

Here beside dwelleth
A riche barons doughter (cl);

and, among Christmas carols, "Good day, sire Christemas our

kinge" (cxxxv), and the "Wolcum, Yole" (cxxxiv) perhaps by Awdlay. None of these can well be after 1550, but it is just possible that one or two may appear in variant versions. (The index of first lines now and then sets traps for the unwary, since it preserves the erratic spelling of the originals. An index of burdens would, I think, have been helpful, and interesting in itself.) If these poems are really missing I have no doubt that Professor Greene had reasons for excluding them, though I do not know what they were, for his corpus of 747 poems (often in several variant versions) is intended to be inclusive, and he has obviously cast his net wide.

No arrangement in order of date was possible, since early texts must often survive in later versions, and no strict classification by subject has been attempted. Roughly, however, the arrangement is as follows: first, carols of Christmas-tide, of the infant Christ, of the Passion, of the Virgin, of the Father and the Son; then, those of Saints, of the Mass, of religious and moral counsel, of doomsday and mortality; lastly, satirical, political, amorous and humorous carols. This is the grouping as explained in the preface, but in fact the headlines to the pages afford a much minuter classification: thus between the carols of mortality and those of a political nature we find not only the heading satirical, but also carols of women, of marriage, of childhood, picaresque, convivial, ale and hunting (the Boar's Head carol of Queen's, since it belongs to Twelfth Night, is grouped with the carols of holly and ivy at the end of the Christmas section).

Professor Greene's introduction, which is both learned and readable, discusses at length such subjects as the nature of the carol, its origin in the dance, its relation to the Christmas song and the ballad, its "background" in Latin compositions liturgical and secular, its popular nature, the prevalence of what may be called religious parody (setting sanctified words to the Devil's tunes), the Franciscan influence, and the Christmas association; ending with a very interesting section on the nature and sources of the burden.

No one will be inclined to question the poetic merit of not a few carols in very different styles, but it may be doubtful whether many or, indeed, any can stand beside the best of the earlier lyrics or the best of the ballads. Among much that is serious or gay or graceful or waggish, it is seldom indeed that we come upon anything with the haunting quality of the famous Corpus Christi carol. Of this, Professor Greene has collected four different texts, no less than three being traditional versions recovered in the nineteenth century,

which, having lost their burden, have become assimilated to the ballad type, and recall such pieces as *The Twa Corbies* and *The Lyke-wake Dirge*. The fourth is a sixteenth-century version from a manuscript at Balliol College, but the original text must surely be much older than that.

Lully, lulley ; lully, lulley ;
The fawcon hath born my mak away.

He bare hym vp, he bare hym down ;
He bare hym into an orchard brown.

In that orchard ther was an hall,
That was hangid with purpill and pall.

And in that hall ther was a bede ;
Hit was hangid with gold so rede.

And in that bed ther lythe a knyght,
His wowndes bledyng day and nyght.

By that bedes side ther kneleth a may,
And she wepeth both nyght and day.

And by that beddes side ther stondith a ston
" Corpus Christi " wretyn thereon.

W. W. GREG.

Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance.

A Study in Critical Distinctions. By H. O. WHITE. (Harvard Studies in English, vol. xii.) Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press ; London : Humphrey Milford. 1935. Pp. xii+209. \$2.50 ; 10s. 6d. net.

THIS study offers an investigation of the views expressed by Englishmen, between 1500 and 1625, on Plagiarism and Imitation, with the object of establishing English renaissance theory on these subjects and of showing that it coincided with English renaissance practice. After a brief analysis of what Imitation connoted to the Latin mind and of the principal discussions of the topic by Italian and French renaissance critics, Dr. White records, in a chronological survey of the period, what English writers had to say on the subject " Before Sidney," " From Sidney to Jonson," and " From Jonson Onward."

His results are not likely to leave anyone much the wiser, as the subject has been tackled on quite the least productive lines. An examination of English renaissance theory of plagiarism is as unprofitable of significant results as plagiarism itself, and Dr. White's conclusions add nothing to the well-established fact that while it

was one of the commonest tricks of the renaissance book-making trade it was at the same time one of the most ruthlessly and rudely exposed. On the subject of Imitation Dr. White is an unreliable guide. His use of the word with reference to English criticism is too casual and shifting to form a steady basis for an examination of renaissance literary theory, and by setting opinions uprooted from their contexts one against another he arrives at conclusions which are definitely misleading. The most flagrant instance is the result of a comparison of Ascham's views and Castiglione's :

The Schoolmaster seems, in the discussion of imitation, to be a direct answer to *The Courtier*. Where *The Courtier* emphasizes the classical methods of using imitation to gain originality, Ascham devotes himself to proving the desirability of imitation in itself.

This is distortion. Ascham is advocating Imitation as "the ready way to the Latin tongue"; Castiglione is discussing the Italian literary language and advising the writer to imitate (*i.e.* to follow) the language of his day. There are no grounds for comparison here and there is certainly no contrast. Castiglione would have agreed with Ascham that the only "ready way" to a dead language was by imitation of literary models.

The material for this study has been collected with industry, but Dr. White has brought to bear on it neither the discrimination nor imagination necessary for its interpretation. From the outset the reader is uncertain whether the subject is "Plagiarism *alias* Imitation" or "Plagiarism and Imitation." The Preface suggests the former; the title and the work itself, the latter. From the outset there is no other sense of direction than the chronological. The source of the trouble is that there has been no preliminary analysis of the constituent elements of Imitation in relation to renaissance problems and aims. In the sixteenth century the nations of Western Europe were faced with a heavy literary and linguistic *agenda*. Imitation was the recognized means of carrying this out. By reference to the educational methods and bias (especially the study of rhetoric), which ingrained the idea of Imitation in the renaissance mind, by comparing the analogous situation of English in the sixteenth century with Latin in Cicero's day, by considering how far Imitation as a literary principle was in reality applied in England during the renaissance, the examination of English literary theory would have been made more significant. A preliminary analysis on these lines would have saved blunders. It would also

have drawn attention to several topics to which the Elizabethan did not necessarily attach the label "Imitation" but which must undoubtedly be considered under this head—the hexameter controversy and the highly relevant problem of Art and Nature, which by the renaissance was more closely bound up with the question of imitation of literary models than with the Aristotelian *mimesis*. Had Dr. White considered this topic, he would have seen that there was more divergence of opinion (for example, between Shakespeare and Jonson) than his inquiry reveals. Had he considered more closely renaissance practice, he would have seen that to prove his thesis of its identity with renaissance theory it was necessary to carry his study down to Milton. By considering the subject in the abstract and by allowing plagiarism to overshadow Imitation, what ought to have been a fruitful branch of literary inquiry has been turned into a rootless stock encumbered by a parasitic growth.

ALICE WALKER.

Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer as Exemplified in the Plays of the First Folio. By RICHMOND NOBLE. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1935. Pp. xii+303. 10s. 6d.

THIS excellent book justifies the claim made by the publishers that it marks a distinct advance on anything previously written on its subject. Every reader of Shakespeare knows the constant references to Holy Scripture—not only allusions to Bible persons and events, but often actual quotations. Every single play furnishes examples, more or fewer; and Mr. Noble finds that no fewer than forty-two books in all of Scripture are quoted from—eighteen of the Old Testament, eighteen New Testament, and six of the Apocrypha.

This being so, it is somewhat remarkable that the subject did not receive attention until comparatively recent times: though no doubt the old Puritan feeling against the theatre explains it. But reconciliation was in the air. A true humanist, Bishop Charles Wordsworth, published in 1864 his delightful little book, *Shakespeare's Use and Knowledge of the Bible*, which immediately ran into several editions. Later came Dr. Thomas Carter's fuller and more detailed Study, *Shakespeare and the English Bible* (1905). Dr. Carter's special service was the recognition of the particular version from

which by far the greater number of Shakespeare's Bible references are drawn. This was the Geneva version of 1560, the work of William Whittingham and his coadjutors, and published, with a dedication to Queen Elizabeth, at the cost of some of the Marian exiles, including in all probability the father of Sir Thomas Bodley. The popular nickname of the "Breeches Bible," from its unlucky rendering of Genesis iii. 7, has led to a general underestimate both of the sound value of this translation and also of its very great popularity. The *Bishops' Bible*, a little later (1568)—which was indeed a very unequal work, too many contributors and no editing to speak of—could not compete with it at all. The late Dr. W. F. Moulton is the authority for the almost incredible statement that no fewer than 150 editions of the Geneva Bible appeared between 1560 and 1616. Even after the coming of the Authorised Version in 1611, this old favourite continued to hold its place for many years.

Mr. Noble has spared no pains to make his book complete. He has worked over the entire field afresh with the utmost thoroughness, and has extended his inquiry to that other fount of noble devotional English, the Book of Common Prayer. While bringing to light a substantial number of Bible references not previously noted, he has perhaps not quite escaped the danger of including too much—places where an allusion to the sacred text, though possible, can hardly be considered certain. A point of some importance is the evidence shown of the poet's occasional use of the Bishops' Bible as well as the Geneva; as the former was naturally that used in church, this is as might be expected. A useful list of Biblical proper names and a first-rate index complete a volume which may set one thinking. How many literary men or journalists to-day know their Bible as well as Shakespeare did, and would a modern audience follow these Bible allusions as well as the groundlings of the Curtain and the Globe?

D. C. MACGREGOR.

Der Sinn des Hamlet. Kunstwerk-Handlung-Überlieferung.

By LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING. Leipzig: Quelle & Neyer. 1935.
Pp. viii + 132. M. 340.

PROFESSOR SCHÜCKING writes with knowledge and enthusiasm, but, although his book will no doubt be very useful to German readers who lack time or inclination to study the vast literature that has

BRIMMOUTH
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

been written on this subject, it can hardly be called an important contribution to our knowledge or appreciation of Shakespeare's play.

Seventy-six of the 132 pages are devoted to an analysis of the play, scene by scene: this contains one or two pertinent and penetrating observations, but will be most useful to those who, in reading about the play, have forgotten to re-read the play itself.

The best things in the book are the observations on the weaknesses in construction after the third act (pp. 39-41), the discussion of Hamlet's age (pp. 112-113), and of the relationship between the First and Second Quartos (pp. 126ff.), where Professor Schücking rightly draws attention to Q1's much more logical and consistent presentation of the events of the second act. He thinks that Shakespeare never intended Q2 for the stage, and that the original acting version forms the substratum of Q1. In his unsupported assumption that the Ur-Hamlet was probably written by Kyd (p. 122) it is to be hoped that Professor Schücking is not revealing himself as a believer in the absurd "kid in Æsop" theory, demolished once and for all, one would have supposed, by Dr. McKerrow in his edition of Nashe.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

Buckingham 1592-1628. By M. A. GIBB. London: Jonathan Cape, Ltd. 1935. Pp. 334. 15s. net.

MR. GIBB's study of George Villiers, first Duke of Buckingham, forms an interesting addition to the handsomely produced and illustrated series of "Academy Books" published by Messrs. Jonathan Cape. The only biographies of the duke hitherto available have been the short contemporary sketch by Sir Henry Wotton published in the *Harleian Miscellany* and the articles in *Biographia Britannica* and the *D.N.B.* A full-length study of this important and interesting figure was needed, and Mr. Gibb has filled the gap in a highly efficient manner. "My aim," he writes in his Preface, "has been to tell an interesting story, and so I have avoided holding up the flow of the narrative by copious references." He has certainly told an interesting story in a clear, flowing, if not particularly distinguished style. He has avoided the temptation of making the book a general history of the reigns of James I and Charles I, and in his own phrase has kept "the light always focused upon the

central figure." His view of Buckingham's character is judicious and well-balanced. He does not attempt to whitewash him or condone his faults, but he destroys the legend that he was a monster of tyranny and selfishness. "For much of his folly," he writes, "posterity has condemned him violently, not recognizing that he was in reality, no vicious tyrannic monster, seeking to establish his own omnipotence at the expense of his country, but rather a rash, impetuous being, unschooled in diplomacy, and captivated by schemes which possessed, for himself at any rate, brilliant prospects of success, whereby the fast-fading fortunes of Great Britain on the Continent might be re-established." The effect of the book on an unbiassed reader is not so much indignation at the Duke's follies and extravagances as amazement at the tragic error of the two kings, who forgot the wisdom of Elizabeth, and, by confusing the functions of the ornamental court favourite with those of the Prime Minister, brought humiliation to England abroad and civil war at home.

Students of English literature will find the book a help toward the understanding of the "seventeenth century background." In spite of the fact that Mr. Gibb gives a good reason for not clogging his narrative with references to authorities, and that he does provide an appendix describing his principal sources, serious students may regret that some of the references that he does give are so meagre and unsatisfactory. For instance, on p. 264 he quotes a poem on the expedition to the Isle of Rhé and ascribes it to "a poetaster of the day," while his footnote only refers to Gardiner's *History*. In Chapter II there is an interesting description of the performance of Ben Jonson's Masque of the *Gipsies Metamorphosed* at Burley in 1621 in honour of James I. It is a pity, however, that, through a misprint or a slip in transcription, Mr. Gibb has made nonsense of one of Jonson's lines by printing "one" in place of "on." Milton was twenty when Buckingham was murdered. He may well have been thinking of the gorgeous processions in which the Duke delighted when he compared Adam's naked dignity with

the tedious pomp that waits
On princes, when their rich retinue long
Of horses led and grooms besmeared with gold
Dazzles the crowd and sets them all agape.

The description (on p. 174 of Mr. Gibb's book) of Buckingham's projected entry into Paris in 1625 with fifteen noblemen, twenty knights, three coaches covered with gold lace, and a hundred and

sixty musicians all dressed in magnificent costumes forms an admirable commentary on Milton's lines.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy. By M. C. BRADBROOK. London: Cambridge University Press. 1935. Pp. viii + 275. 12s. 6d. net.

MISS BRADBROOK has rendered a considerable service to students of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century drama by her insistence upon those aspects of its provenance too often neglected even to-day. In theoretic form in Part I and by practical application in Part II she impresses upon us the dangers of assuming that the mental processes, field and associations of the Elizabethans necessarily had much in common with those of to-day. It was not merely a structurally different stage that gave them their different æsthetic standards; they approached the drama, whether as audience, actor, or playwright, with a different preliminary history and so are widely separated not only from the modern critic, but from the modern dramatist and even from the modern theatre-man.

The whole book, but particularly the opening chapters, where the operation of convention is analysed in presentation, acting, dramatic structure, and speech, is full of stimulating suggestions that would themselves serve as the starting-points of highly interesting studies; Miss Bradbrook drives home, for instance, not only the fact (which we all accept) that the Elizabethan scene was unlocated, but the effects of this in the themes and conventions of the drama itself (p. 10 *seq.*); she examines the cause and the nature of double time (p. 13), the importance of the audience's interest in the "surface meaning of words" and the part played in the theory and practice of dramatic art by the possibility of direct speech to the audience. "Actually," she says, "the graduation between the frank appeal *ad spectatores* and the subtlest romances of Shakespearean dramaturgy, make the dead-level of modern dialogue seem a very primitive affair" (p. 112) and there are few of us who would not heartily agree.

The theory seems at first reading a little over-closely packed in the first three chapters and, in Chapter III, at times a little unsubstantiated. But the substantiation, or a great part of it, follows in the clear and closely reasoned Chapters IV and V ("Elizabethan

Habits of Reading, Writing, and Listening " and " Conventions of Speech ") and in the analyses of the individual dramatists that make up the second part of the book. Specially noticeable is the study of Tourneur, where Miss Bradbrook lays out clearly the formalized patterns of the language (including imagery), of the peripeteia in the action and of the relations of the characters, and the study of Webster, which, in the penetrating analysis of pp. 197-209, makes a valuable addition to our knowledge of the background of the play and offers a new interpretation of Webster's own view of the conduct of the Duchess of Malfi, seen by the light of contemporary assumptions.

A book as stimulating as this must at times appear also provocative. Many of her readers will necessarily be at issue with the author upon some matters of detail—in the case of the present writer on her estimate of Tourneur's puns (p. 172), of his interpretation of Nature (p. 175), of the theatrical effectiveness of the death-speech of Flamineo (p. 211), of the presence or absence of form in *The Broken Heart* (p. 256), or the position of *Perkin Warbeck* (p. 260), but these are, after all, of relatively minor importance. Some will, however, differ from her on more fundamental issues, involving the approach to her main thesis itself. It is inevitable that, in this book, convention and pattern should be the main business of the author, and we owe her a debt for defining and illustrating them so clearly. But there is something disquieting in her insistence upon these habits and conventions of writing as the main business of the dramatists themselves. It is something more than a nineteenth-century habit in us, I think, that regards the major drama as primarily an attempt on the part of the dramatist (from Æschylus to O'Neill) to interpret life in portraying it. Unfortunate as it may have been to judge the Elizabethans—and there are few of us who have not been guilty of it at some time—in terms of nineteenth-century psychological and theatrical assumptions, it may be still more unfortunate to deny, as between them and us, the common basis of " the human heart by which we live." It is hard to see, this denied, how the great Jacobean drama ever occurred, and when Miss Bradbrook's theory leads her to say, " The advance of psychology has made it plain that even Shakespeare's characters leave much to be desired " (p. 52), that certain episodes in *Measure for Measure* " had no moral valency at all " (p. 60), that, except for Shakespeare " there is no mental interplay " revealed in a drama which contains

(to go no further) *The Changeling* and *Women Beware Women*, one is tempted to suggest that the author is regarding as indications of species, if not of genus itself, what some of us would regard as separable accidents, while what she considers evidence, for example, of a conventional theatre "double personality" (p. 68) is to us rather an indication of the poet's knowledge of the multiple personality of which most men are aware in themselves and others.

This fundamental difference of orientation apart, one can give genuine admiration to the originality of some of the theory and to the body of reading which lies behind it, and, if there persists a demand for a fuller working out of the argument and for a fuller substantiation at some points, it is perhaps because the material so generously packed into this book might easily have made two.

[In one or two places (pp. 21, 81, 155, for example) the footnotes might helpfully be amplified without the use of much additional space, and there are one or two misprints which might be adjusted; the edition of Marlowe's plays, for example, referred to on p. 154 (fn.) was published not by Macmillan but by Methuen.]

U. M. ELLIS-FERMOR.

England's Helicon (1600, 1614). Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1935. Vol. i, Text, pp. xiv+228; vol. ii., Introduction, Notes, and Indexes, pp. viii+241. \$3.00; 12s. 6d. net, each volume.

WITH these two spacious volumes Professor Rollins has completed the enterprise, which he began more than ten years ago, of making available in scholarly editions the most important of the Elizabethan poetical miscellanies. *England's Helicon* worthily upholds the exceptional standards of fullness and accuracy set by the earlier volumes and illustrates as copiously as any of them the range of Professor Rollins's researches, his vast reading in the literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and his mastery of bibliographical method. There is little doubt that, with the exception of Tottell's *Songes and Sonettes*, concerning which important new facts have come to light since Professor Rollins issued his edition, these volumes will for many years to come remain the standard editions of their texts. As a quarry for future historians of literature they will be of immense value, containing as they do in readily accessible form the results of all

the investigations that have been carried out on the miscellanies during the half-century since the work of Arber and Bullen was done.

As with the earlier collections, Professor Rollins's chief concern in this edition of *England's Helicon* has been the text of the poems. He has also given much attention to the problem of identifying the original editor and the question of how far that editor's ascriptions of authorship may be depended on. Into the field of literary criticism he has ventured only a little way.

He has reprinted the text from the John Rylands copy of the first edition, following the original page for page and line for line, with the same modifications as he adopted for his edition of *A Poetical Rhapsody*—that is to say, all errors except unmistakable misprints are retained and corrections from earlier printed and manuscript versions are assembled in the notes and variant readings. The text is, therefore, almost a type-facsimile. Professor Rollins justifies this procedure by the contention that "to emend texts which the compiler of the *Helicon* has already consciously (only occasionally by error) emended is indefensible" and that the student who "wishes to know what Spenser and Yong and Lodge wrote" will go "to *The Shepherd's Calendar* and *Diana* and *Rosalind* or to the editor's notes." Much can be said in support of this view, but some may question whether it would not have been more to the interest of university students, who are the people likely to make most use of the book, to print a critical text and transfer the compiler's mistakes, alterations, and "improvements" to the variant readings and the notes.

The nine poems that were added in the second edition are reprinted from the British Museum copy. In the list of variant readings appended to the first volume the text of the second edition is collated with that of the first, only verbal differences being noted; misprints and differences of spelling and punctuation are ignored. The word *soft* has twice been misprinted *soft*—at p. 80, line 21 and p. 197, line 8.

The introduction is a most important piece of work and so far, at least, as the problems connected with the editorship are concerned, must inevitably form the starting-point for future investigators. Careful bibliographical descriptions of the first two editions and a census of copies known to Professor Rollins are given, together with a critical account of the five modern editions that have appeared

since 1812 and a sound appreciation of their varied merits. Following the bibliographical sections are brief notices of the authors represented in the collection, the chief item of interest being the assignment of four poems subscribed with the initials H. C. to Henry Chettle. Previous editors have thought they were the work of Henry Constable, but Professor Rollins gives convincing reasons for attributing them to the author of *Piers Plainness' Seven Years' Prenticeship*. He also reprints and discusses the "Catalog of y^e Poems contayned in Englands Helicon" which Francis Davison made in preparation for *A Poetical Rhapsody*, but admits that "the chief interest of the list comes rather in the evidence it gives" of Davison's own reading than in the light it throws on the problems of authorship presented by the *Helicon*.

In his discussion of the origin of *England's Helicon* and the identity of the compiler, Professor Rollins gives by far the fullest account yet available of a problem that has baffled scholars at least since the time of Malone. Three men have been considered to have a claim to the editorship: (1) John Bodenham, to whom the work is dedicated and who has long been known to have inspired three other collections of verse and prose extracts that appeared between 1597 and 1600 as well as *England's Helicon*, namely, *Politeuphuia*, *Wits Commonwealth*; *Wits Theater of the Little World*; and *Belvedere*; (2) an unidentified A.B. who wrote the dedicatory Sonnet to Bodenham, which constitutes the chief item of evidence regarding the editorship, and a prose address to Bodenham's friends Nicholas Wanton and George Faucet; (3) the L. N. whose initials were appended to the preface and were believed by the late Professor Hebel to be those of Nicholas Ling transposed. Professor Rollins's marshalling of the evidence for and against all three is a model of what such an exposition should be. Most readers will agree with his conclusion that Bodenham did not edit *England's Helicon*, although he was undoubtedly the originator and patron of the work and drew up the plan of it. Nevertheless, the evidence does not quite rule out the possibility that Bodenham did some of the preliminary work.

Concerning the rival claims of A. B. and L. N., Professor Rollins is less convincing. As against the view of Bullen and Crawford that the dedicatory Sonnet could be interpreted to mean that A. B. was the editor, he believes that the words "My paines heerein, I cannot terme it great" are an admission by A. B. that he "had only a slight share in the actual work," merely "seeing the book through

the press"; and that the real editor was almost certainly L. N., whom he follows Hebel in identifying with the stationer Nicholas Ling, the partner of John Flasket, for whom the *Helicon* was printed. The belief, upon which this interpretation rests, that L. N.'s *Preface to the Reader* could have been written only by the editor, is questionable on several grounds. For instance, L. N. might have been referring to A. B. rather than to himself, as Professor Rollins believes, when he mentioned "the Collector of the same." And Ling, if L. N. may be considered to represent that versatile stationer, having edited *Politeuphuia* for Bodenham would be conversant with Bodenham's design for the *Helicon* and would be as capable as anyone of discussing the editor's "purposes and his difficulties, defending his choice of selections, and explaining the methods used in attributing the authorship," as is done in the preface. The further argument, deriving from Professor Hebel, that the *Helicon* texts of Drayton's poems tell in favour of Ling as editor, since they appear to have been taken from Drayton's own manuscripts or his manuscript corrections in a printed text and because Drayton and Ling were lifelong friends, applies with almost equal cogency to A. B. For it is legitimate to presume that as a friend of Bodenham Ling would have placed at the disposal of Bodenham's editors his texts of Drayton's poems. The fact, pointed out by Professor Rollins, that Ling had previously published for several other authors whose works were laid under contribution for *England's Helicon* can hardly be said to strengthen the belief that Ling edited the collection. Lastly, no adequate reason has ever been advanced to explain why Ling should have elected to reverse his initials at the end of the preface.

The question must, I think, remain open, and pending the production of further evidence it seems best to accept the conclusions of Professors Hebel and Hudson, who sum up the matter thus (*Poetry of the English Renaissance*, 1929, p. 949): "The *Helicon* was projected, if not actually edited by John Bodenham. . . . The actual editor may have been the A. B. who writes some of the prefatory notices, or Nicholas Ling."

The remainder of the introduction treats of the pastoralism of the anthology; the methods by which the compiler transposed conventional Elizabethan love-lyrics into a pastoral key and his lack of respect for his texts; the editing of the second edition; and the evidence for the abiding popularity of the collection. Also the conclusions of recent research into the identity of John Boden-

ham and his uncle Nicholas Wanton are admirably summarized. It would, perhaps, have been more profitable to students if the variety of metres and the interesting stanzaic experiments of *England's Helicon* had been dealt with under a separate heading in the introduction rather than left to be treated as they arise, in the notes.

The notes are indeed of quite extraordinary value and variety and it is a pleasure to consult them by reason of the completeness of the index. They contain a wealth of illustrative matter culled from Professor Rollins's wide reading in the literature of the period, minute collations of earlier printed versions and authoritative manuscripts, a profusion of source-material, and information regarding early uses of several English words that in many cases supplements that found in the Oxford Dictionary. I have noticed only two misprints in the second volume: at p. 95, line 9, 3.13 for 34.13; and at p. 74, line 1, *that* instead of *than*.

H. J. BYROM.

John Ford. By M. JOAN SERGEAUNT. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1935. Pp. x + 232. 12s. 6d. net.

To students of seventeenth-century drama who do not possess the valuable contributions to our knowledge of Ford's biography already made by this author,¹ the present volume is indispensable. Even, in fact, to those who do possess the articles in question; for Miss Sergeant has here added to her findings and incorporated the result in her two opening chapters, giving a clear summary of the facts hitherto known, or recently discovered by her, which can with reasonable certainty be associated with Ford's life and with the circumstances of the writing of his plays. "Reasonable certainty" is, indeed, the apparent aim of this work. It is clear-cut and definite in statement, but gives short shrift to conjecture. If the author thinks the evidence indicates a certain fact she says so; if she thinks that, in the present state of our knowledge, no deduction can profitably be made in any direction, she says so equally plainly. We are soon tolerably convinced that no unsubstantiated facts are going to be foisted on to us, or, worse still, bogus substantiation rigged to look like genuine support. A vast deal of the matter of "lives"

¹ M. Joan Sergeant: "John Ford at the Middle Temple," *R.E.S.*, Jan., 1932; "Bequests to John Ford," *R.E.S.*, Oct., 1933; "Writings attributed to Ford by the antiquary Hunter," *R.E.S.*, Apr., 1934.

like Gifford's (not to scant him of due respect) carries away before treatment like this; but what remains is seaworthy. For its good sense and its abstemious, critical use of evidence, this book deserves our gratitude.

It is particularly valuable not only for its discussion of Ford's life but for its treatment of the problems of the authorship of his early plays and of the chronology of his later. There is unfortunately little fresh evidence to be adduced on the question in which most of us are mainly concerned, the order of the great plays. All that the author can do here is to sum up the various previous readings of extant evidence and add her own (and for this she argues well, especially for the relatively late position she gives to *The Lover's Melancholy*). But in discussing the authorship problems of the group written in collaboration just before the major plays she gives us some clear and balanced expositions. To *The Witch of Edmonton* she wisely applies (pp. 35-41) the extremely relevant information on collaboration methods in Professor Sisson's *Keep the Widow Waking*.¹ For *The Spanish Gypsy* (pp. 41-57) her amplification of the arguments of Mr. Dugdale Sykes to show Ford's authorship is so convincing as practically to convert at any rate the present writer, though long a believer in Middleton's claim. In the same way, reasonable (though necessarily not, at this date, startling) illumination is thrown on the similar problems of the two remaining plays of this group, *The Sun's Darling* and *The Fair Maid of the Inn*. The author sums up both her conclusions and her methods when she says, "The re-ascription of a play on internal evidence alone is a task not to be undertaken 'unadvisedly, lightly or wantonly.' . . . Complete certainty can rarely be achieved in this world, but it may fairly be claimed that at least a reasonable degree of probability of Ford's par tauthorship of *The Spanish Gypsy* is reached by the combined evidence of similarity of diction, imagery, style, structure, characterization and ideas" (p. 57).

When she turns from these problems to discuss the content of the plays in dramatic art or as an index to the nature of Ford's thought, she is less happy. She clearly appreciates his outstanding quality seen from both these aspects and takes due account of his reticence, his power of condensed utterance, his fine, close character-drawing and his intermittently remarkable structural skill. There are penetrating analyses of certain characters—Eroclea, Cleophila, Annabella,

¹ *The Library*, Fourth Series, vol. viii., pp. 39-57 and 233-59.

the Friar, Bianca, Spinella, Flavia—the choice of some of these itself marking the genuine lover of Ford. She admits frankly the weakness of the comic scenes and characters and does not try to gloss it over, nor, while explaining it, to explain it away.¹ She speaks, in Chapter VII, of the nature of the plain style of Ford (though some of us may think she gives Middleton a little less than his due in this field) and there is an interesting passage on the balancing of Perkin Warbeck's character.

But the caution which was so great a merit in the biographical section of the book is here something more like weakness. There is a tendency to avoid issues, to refuse sometimes the kind of statement which the critic must risk—if he undertake to discuss content at all. Chapters IV, V, and VI are in this way full of points of interest which are seldom so grouped as to form a sustained argument leading to a clear conclusion. Ever and again the final pulling together seems to be shirked, the drawing of inferences and conclusions from analyses and statements in themselves ably made. Instead of these conclusions, we are too often offered the words of authorities who, however sacred, can hardly at this point take the place of the author's own estimates. Thus, even when finally² she proposes to herself the question of "the real and permanent value" of the plays, the author hardly speaks firmly enough for one who has experienced years of association with her subject. After half a paragraph she falls back on Lamb. True it may be that no critical estimate has surpassed Lamb's. But if that is enough to excuse the author's own interpretation here, it and similar estimates might reasonably excuse also the rest of the book in so far as it directly treats Ford's thought and art. You cannot have it both ways. Either a critic has an æsthetic experience of his own to offer us, transmitted to him by his author's record of an artistic experience, or his concern is not primarily with the content, viewed æsthetically, at all. Something of the same weakness is noticeable again when (after herself warning us against confusing Ford's morality with his art) the author proceeds in Chapter V to some scattered and inconclusive comments on the moral issues in certain of the plays. Now this seems a subject on which compromise or the effort to find a middle way is irremediably out of place. Either Ford had a morbidly overheated imagination with a taste for sexual

¹ See, especially, such a passage as that on the function of the sub-plot of *'Tis Pity* (p. 108).

² P. 154.

aberration which he somehow contrived to silver over—with by some odd psychological process—with an appearance of cool and exquisite austerity, or, as some of us believe, his was one of those stainless minds which can walk where they will without defilement. In either case he neither needs nor can be helped by a lukewarm defence. The moral system of John Ford is no place for the critic who would proceed with caution; it is one of those rare cases where one cannot, with the best will in the world, conclude that there is something to be said on both sides.

But it would be ungenerous to conclude on this point, for those of us who have worked in this field have been indebted to Miss Sergeaunt's researches for some years. For her treatment of biography, canon, and chronology, for her often acute analyses of Ford's psychological knowledge, and not least for the emphasis she lays on the unjustly neglected *Lover's Melancholy*, we owe her much.

UNA M. ELLIS-FERMOR.

The Diary of Thomas Crosfield, M.A., B.D., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. Selected and edited from the MS. in the Queen's College Library for the Royal Society of Literature by F. S. BOAS. London: Humphrey Milford. 1935. Pp. xxix + 169. 12s. 6d. net.

DR. BOAS and the Royal Society of Literature have provided us with an interesting book. Thomas Crosfield's *Diary* has been previously used to illustrate particular topics of the seventeenth century—plays, games, ecclesiastical affairs. Now Dr. Boas has given us a quasi-facsimile edition of "those entries which seem of permanent interest—about three-fourths of the *Diary* proper." It is indeed a "tardy justice" that has been done. Crosfield does not rank with Wood or Hearne as an Oxford diarist; he wrote little and had wider interests. But he contrives to tell us much of Oxford, and he has a charm which they have not.

The *Diary* covers mainly the years 1626–39, and as an intelligent and sensitive man Crosfield found much to interest him during those ominous years. He was merely an ear-witness of European wars and English politics, but he is an original authority for Oxford and English social life. He writes about music, the stage (Dr. Boas has previously printed the conversation with Richard Kendall), books, card games, College discipline, the King's visit to Oxford, etc. He

tells us of "Dr. Donne, deane of Pauls, his powerfull kinde of preaching by his gesture & Rhetoriquall expression." He is always liable to insert an entry such as "Five delightfull materialls for the taste. 1 comfitts as coriander, violet, orange, 2^d a pound. . . ." He surprises us once by getting a letter from Canada. Many entries in the *Diary* are in Latin; they range from theology to this: "die Lunae sub nocte aliquis fur extrahebat è fenestra Culinae 3s."

Dr. Boas has edited the book well. He has a full introduction and has kept his notes as short as was compatible with explaining a difficult text. He finds his way skilfully among the minutiae of Oxford life three hundred years ago. Might not however the "Mr. Wither of Edmond Hall" on p. 65 be Samuel Withers, who took his M.A. in 1632? There are one or two minor points. The editor's name is given in Patrick Young's edition of St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, Oxford, 1633; but the title page being in Latin, it appears as Patricius Iunius. (For an interesting letter of King Charles about the book, see Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, 1714, v. II, *A Collection of Records*, p. 111.) The notes for 1638 are put under the year 1637. And the reference under July 10, 1628 (p. 116) to December 2, 1635 should be to 1634.

ARTHUR TILLOTSON.

John Bunyan, Mechanick Preacher. By WILLIAM YORK TINDALL, Instructor in English, Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934. Foreign Agent: Oxford University Press. Price 17s. 6d.

MR. TINDALL is evidently a diligent student of seventeenth-century England and a capable researcher. But his book, elaborate and minutely documented as it is, is not only dreary reading, but is vitiated from the first by the author's frankly avowed purpose in writing it. This, we are told in the preface, "is to show that John Bunyan was a typical mechanick preacher, and that his writings owe their nature both to the social, economic, and sectarian condition of their author, and to the literary conventions of a numerous company of mechanicks." The archaic spelling, it is explained, is retained on purpose; but surely this meticulous care was hardly worth while, since we all know the "mechanicals" in the *Midsummer Night's Dream*; one indeed, Snout the tinker, was of Bunyan's own trade. Having thus labelled once for all the

author of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, Mr. Tindall proceeds in chapter after chapter to illustrate the fanatical and extravagant doctrines and practices of "Bunyan's inelegant, restless, and now unremembered class." From the Quakers, the Ranters, the Muggletonians, and multitudes more, "he differed," we are told (p. 21) with an odd naïveté, "only in details of theology, in the accident of genius, and in that felicitous restraint which, though it permitted the exhibition of ardour, tempered his holiness and preserved him from excess." One by one, Bunyan's principal writings have Mr. Tindall's new searchlight turned upon them, to show that, but for the "accident" just referred to, their author was merely doing what other "mechanick preachers" did. *Grace Abounding*, that soul-drama which has no parallel since the *Confessions* of St. Augustine, was, it appears, a kind of advertisement of the author's spiritual experience and consequent fitness for the work of a preacher. In the case of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, again, the main object was controversial, but the characters were largely portraits of neighbours or contemporaries; and the same thing applies still more strongly to the *Holy War*. All this is poor stuff enough, though "the accident of genius" is a gem worth remembering; would Mr. Tindall suggest that, but for a similar "accident," John Keats was much like any other medical student, and Charles Dickens merely a smart young reporter?

But there is worse than this to complain of in Mr. Tindall's book. The odd prejudice against his subject, revealed in his opening sentence, passes the limits of decency a few pages later on. The weird forms fanaticism sometimes assumed in the seventeenth century are described in considerable detail. Undoubtedly there were crazy creatures then, as there are crazy creatures now, but Mr. Tindall allows that Bunyan was "among the more moderate enthusiasts." Having admitted this, however, he goes on to say (p. 18): "John Bunyan never removed his clothing in public, but the difference between him and those who did was only of degree." One marvels how any man aspiring to be a historian, any man who has ever felt the grave dignity and moral elevation of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, could pen such a sentence. Yet does it not show the triumph of Bunyan? Here is the twentieth-century research student appearing in the character of the Man with the Muck-rake.

Hardly less disgraceful is the allusion (p. 12) to what is described as "the unfortunate affair of Agnes Beaumont, a handsome girl of

his flock," in which Bunyan "submitted with a sigh to the suspicion of impropriety." The innuendo is unmistakable. Happily, this contemptible slander has been branded as it deserved by Dr. G. B. Harrison in his edition of *The Narrative of the Persecution of Agnes Beaumont in 1674* (Constable, 1929). Every reader of that artless but extraordinarily vivid story must recognize in the Bedfordshire maiden of twenty-two one of the heroines of Puritan England, a soul aflame with the same spiritual ardour as St. Theresa and St. Clare. Because she would not promise never again to hear Bunyan preach, her father locked his doors against her for two winter nights, compelling her to sleep in a barn where the mud froze upon her shoes. On the third day, with many qualms of conscience, the poor girl gave way, and agreed not to go to hear the preacher without her father's consent. But worse was to come, for the reconciled parent now suddenly died, and an anti-Puritan neighbour put it about that Agnes had poisoned him. The coroner came with his "jewry," and the wicked invention was blown to the winds; the coroner giving a strong piece of his mind to the slanderer, who must, one would think, have brought himself within reach of the law had there been anyone to take the matter up. Such is "the unfortunate affair of Agnes Beaumont." Mr. Tindall's epithet "handsome," though probably true, is a touch of his own, put in to give the whole episode the desired colour. What are we to say of a research student who must be aware of all these facts and yet supplies just so much as virtually amounts to a *suggestio falsi*, setting in an ambiguous light the author of one of the greatest books in our language, and one of the great religious forces in the life of England? Mr. Tindall refers slightly in his introduction to all Bunyan's previous biographers, with the single exception of Dr. John Brown. The earlier ones he finds unreliable from "political and sectarian bias," the later from "sentimentality." Macaulay, Froude, and Mark Rutherford presumably all belong to the latter class. One wonders, when reading, what these men would have thought, and said, about Mr. Tindall.

DUNCAN C. MACGREGOR.

Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century. By ETHEL SEATON. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1935. Pp. xvi+384. 15s. net.

MISS SEATON'S book deals with "Literary Relations" in the widest sense of the term, as is shown by the headings of some of the

chapters—"Trade and Travel," "Political Ties of Great Britain with Sweden and Denmark," "Ambassadors as Liaison-Officers," "The Work of Antiquarians and the Learned," and "Popular Superstitions." The last chapter, "The Scandinavian Impress upon English Literature," is, however, concerned with the influence of Scandinavian tales, the Scandinavian scene, and of Scandinavian themes in drama.

We have as the result of Miss Seaton's patient exploration of innumerable nooks and crannies in England and Scandinavia a great store of recondite information. She takes us down many unfrequented byways, and while some lead to rather barren fields, others bring us to fertile pastures. But under such an agreeable and enthusiastic guide we forget the tedium of even the dullest parts of the journey. Little has hitherto been known of this subject and that little acquires a new coherence and a clearer perspective in Miss Seaton's hands. Her extensive investigations prove that in the course of the seventeenth century the ignorance of Scandinavia prevalent in Elizabethan times was transformed into knowledge, thus laying the foundation for the work of men like Percy and Gray.

That part of the book which treats of English relations with Sweden is not free from omissions, of which the following may be selected for mention: (1) The importance of the corantoës relating to the Thirty Years' War does not appear to have been appreciated by Miss Seaton. They certainly deserve much fuller treatment than they receive. (2) In the account of English contacts with Sweden in the sixteenth century reference might be made to William Spelman, the uncle of Sir Henry, who in 1560 visited Stockholm and commented on the legal system (*cf. A Dialogue or Confabulation between two travellers*, ed. J. E. L. Pickering, London, 1896, p. 40). (3) A diary containing allusions to Gustavus Adolphus is that of John Rous (Camden Society, 1856), and another, too recently made accessible perhaps to have found its way into Miss Seaton's book, is that of Thomas Crosfield, ed. F. S. Boas, London, 1935. (4) Attention might also be called to *The Swedish Discipline*, a work which played its part in the training of the armies in the Civil War (*cf. C. H. Firth, Cromwell's Army*, 3rd ed., London, 1921). (5) *The Reign of Gustavus King of Sweden, Son of Ericus*, London, 1658, is interesting, because of the implied parallel between Gustavus and Cromwell, a parallel which, it may be remarked, Queen Christina emphasized in conversation with Whitelock. (6) A similar use

of events in Swedish history is illustrated by a pamphlet entitled *The causes and manner of deposing a Popish King in Sweden*, London, 1688 (cf. *Harleian Miscellany*, 1808-13, vol. vii, pp. 532-4). (7) *Letters relating to the Mission of Sir T. Roe to Gustavus Adolphus* (*Camden Miscellany*, vol. vii), and *The Swedish Cloak of Religion*, published in 1659, also appear to have escaped Miss Seaton's attention. (8) P. 72, note 5. T. A. Fischer, *The Scots in Sweden*, Edinburgh, 1907, is the authority on this subject. (9) P. 87, note 5. Wood's account is corroborated by the fact that a Latin poem by Gil, written in 1635 on the anniversary of the death of Gustavus Adolphus, is still preserved in MS. Tanner 306, fol. 80, at the Bodleian Library. (10) P. 110, note 3. The following pamphlets were also written as a result of the Benson-Bankes controversy: (a) *Some remarks by way of answer to a late pamphlet entituled a letter to Sir J. B.*, London, 1711; (b) *A second letter to Sir J—B—*, London, 1711; (c) *Reason and gospel against matter of fact: or, reflections upon two letters to Sir J. B.*, London, 1711. (11) P. 144. Benedictus Queckfeldt's *Disputatio juridica inauguralis de Obligationibus ex Contractibus*, published at Oxford in 1656 (cf. F. Madan, *Oxford Books*, vol. iii, item 2311) deserves mention. (12) P. 152. The volume entitled *Learned Tico Brahe his astronomicall conjectur of the new **, published in 1632, should be noted. (13) Miss Seaton does not record that there were two issues of Anthony Nixon's *The Warres of Swethland*, a fact which appears to prove that interest was taken in the subject in 1609; nor does she indicate (p. 19) that the account given by Purchas of the experiences of English mercenaries in the Swedish service is merely a reprint of Nixon's *Swethland and Poland warres*, 1610. The book is extremely rare, but according to the *Short Title Catalogue* a copy of the original is in the possession of Queen's College, Oxford, and another copy is known.

The following errors have been noted: (1) P. 50. The latest investigation of Messenius provides no support for the view that he was influenced by Shakespeare (cf. H. Lidell, *Studier i Johannes Messenius Dramer*, Uppsala, 1935). (2) P. 61. The Marquis of Northampton was married to Helena Snakenborg in 1571 and he died the same year, not in 1570 (cf. C. A. Bradford, *Helena, Marchioness of Northampton*, London, 1936, p. 58). (3) P. 62. The reputed similarity of plan between Longford Castle and Tycho Brahe's Uranienborg is groundless (cf. Bradford, *op. cit.*, p. 73).

(4) Pp. 78 and 232. *A Short Survey of the Kingdome of Sweden* appeared in 1632, not in 1639. (5) P. 81. The name of the author of *The Swedish Intelligencer* is given as Sir Thomas Roe, but in the Bibliography, p. 355, the work is attributed to William Watts. Roe is generally regarded as the author. Moreover, there were more than six parts, and after *The Swedish Intelligencer* came to an end the kind of news that it had given was continued in *The Principall Passages of Germany, Italy, France and other places*. (6) P. 87. George Tooke's *The Eagle-Trusser's Elegie* was first published, not in 1660, but in his work *The Belides* (1647). (7) P. 90, note 3. *Pills to Purge Melancholy* should read *An Antidote against Melancholy: Made up in Pills*. This work, published in 1661, has evidently been confused with D'Urfey's *Wit and Mirth: or Pills to purge Melancholy*, printed in 1719. (8) P. 112, note 3. The title of the work is more accurately given on p. 93, note 4, for James Howell was merely the translator, not the author. (9) P. 113, note 9. Carr's book appeared in 1688, as is stated in the Bibliography, p. 352, and not in 1668. (10) P. 192. The great fire occurred, not at Stockholm in June, 1702, but at Uppsala in May of that year.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

Religion and Learning. A Study in English Presbyterian Thought from the Bartholomew Ejections (1662) to the Foundation of the Unitarian Movement. By OLIVE M. GRIFFITHS. London: Cambridge University Press. 1935. Pp. viii+202. 12s. 6d. net.

THE subject of this admirably written and learned book is the change in fundamental religious beliefs which took place among the English Presbyterians between their final ejection from the Church of England in 1662 and the adoption of Unitarian views by most of them at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Miss Griffiths begins her study with a sketch of English Presbyterianism up to the Restoration Act of Uniformity and the St. Bartholomew's day ejections. She shows that both the Elizabethan and Caroline Presbyterians in England were conservative and strictly orthodox, desiring not a disruption of the Church of England, but changes in its Government and discipline that would have brought it closer to what they believed to have been the organization of the primitive Church. She proves that they were, in fact,

extreme and rigid reactionaries rather than modernists or revolutionaries, and she rightly stresses their attachment to the Calvinist doctrine of the supremacy of the unconditioned will of God as opposed to his intelligence. She gives a lively and interesting description of the position of the Presbyterians of the Restoration period under the Clarendon Code, when in a thoroughly illogical and peculiarly English fashion, although heavily penalized by the laws, they were nevertheless regarded sympathetically by a large part of the population, supported by many influential people, and were able to enrich themselves by trade and enter the legal and medical professions. The core of Miss Griffiths's book is to be found in her acute and extremely interesting description of the crisis in English thought in the latter part of the seventeenth century, when the traditional Aristotelianism was challenged by the scientists, the neo-epicureans, and the Platonists, and her demonstration, based on much careful research, that the Presbyterians on account of their exclusion from Oxford and Cambridge were brought into close contact with the new developments of thought both at their own academies in England and at the Scottish and Dutch Universities. The reader who has been used to think of Presbyterianism and Calvinism as interchangeable terms will be astonished to find that by the end of the seventeenth century many English Presbyterians had actually abandoned the fundamental doctrines of Calvin and adopted that very Arminian theology which their predecessors in the reign of Charles I had so bitterly condemned in Laud and the High Churchmen. From Arminianism Miss Griffiths traces the drift of the Presbyterians first to Arianism and then to Socinianism and Unitarianism under the influence of the rationalism of the eighteenth century and the scientific theories and discoveries of such men as Hartley and Priestley.

Religion and Learning is excellently written, well arranged, and has a useful bibliography. It is not, like many modern books by academic writers, merely a workmanlike record of painstaking research. It is a record of this kind, but it is also the product of a mind with a thorough understanding of the nature of philosophic problems and a wide knowledge of the history of European philosophy. Miss Griffiths never loses sight of the fact that the events which she is describing are part of what she calls in her introduction "the history of the larger question of the relationship between secular learning and religious credenda," and she brings the old

theologies to life by acute comparisons with the opinions of F. H. Bradley and other modern thinkers. Her book is a truly valuable contribution to the history of English thought, and should be neglected by no serious student of the English literature of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

The Letters of John Keats. Edited by MAURICE BUXTON FORMAN. Second Edition with Revisions and Additional Letters. Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. lxix+560. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS volume is a revised edition, with a few additions, of Mr. Maurice Buxton Forman's definitive edition of Keats's *Letters* in two volumes of 1931, which itself was based on Mr. Harry Buxton Forman's edition of the *Letters* published in 1901.

The edition of 1935 embodies a careful recension of the text of 1931.

In reviewing that text (*R.E.S.*, January, 1932) we ventured a protest against the modern pedantry which marred this scrupulous editor's procedure with his text. He set himself to record Keats's wayward spelling and punctuation, making use of footnote and square bracket, and we complained that his procedure was inconsistent: "sometimes he leaves the mis-spelt word unnoted, sometimes follows it with an apologetic [*sic*], thus 'perphaps [*sic*]' ; sometimes with a square bracket enclosing the right spelling, thus 'that [*for* than]' ; sometimes he inserts the missing letter in a square bracket within the mis-spelt word, thus 'sho[r]t' ; sometimes he puts the right form in the text, giving Keats's erroneous form in a footnote."

In the revised edition Mr. Forman has reformed his procedure, though he has not reformed it altogether. The offending [*sic*] is dropped, and "perphaps" appears unashamed without it, the footnote is not used to record spellings, and the method of enclosure by *conical* bracket has superseded the earlier confusion of methods. But the scholar no less than the general reader must still regret the unnecessary obstruction offered by such printing as: "I have scarce a doubt of immortality of some nature of < *for* or > other." "Miltonic verse cannot be written but it < *for* in > the vein of art." All praise to the meticulous and self-denying care with which Mr. Forman revises his text: we note that in one letter where in 1931

the text runs "but when I took [cherry ?] Brandy they were quite convinced," in 1935 he cautiously substitutes "when I took <torn> Brandy."

Mr. Forman has been able to add ten new letters, and has further revised and replenished the biographical notes on Keats's correspondents, first compiled by Mr. H. Buxton Forman. Among the new letters there is a note to Haydon written on December 31, 1818, which ends with the sentence "I met Wordsworth on Hampstead Heath this morning," a chance meeting in the open air which preceded, we are glad to know, his next sight of Wordsworth "in a stiff collar" dressed up to go to dinner with Kingston the Commissioner of Stamps, the Kingston of Haydon's immortal party, whose Christian name Mr. Forman has now discovered to be John. One of the new letters to his sister Fanny is a long and careful answer written in March, 1819, to a series of questions concerning the Catechism, which she had put him when she was being prepared for Confirmation. The letter shows that he took trouble to find and send her a suitable book which would solve her difficulties. It shows also that he had entered into them himself, but does not imply any profound searching into the meaning of Christian dogma. It is fragrant with his affectionate care for her in small things as well as great (he promises in the opening sentence to call at the Nursery for the seeds and roots that she wants).

The whole volume, now as complete a collection as we can wish for, admirably printed and securely edited, is a treasure cheaply bought for 12s. 6d. No student of Keats can do without it. Mr. Forman has given us everything there was to give—notes written in boyish high spirits, sprinkled with *ex tempore* puns, jokes, and grossnesses; letters scrawled in the weakness and torment of illness and passion; journal-letters to his brother and sister full of domestic and personal detail. No man was ever so fully betrayed. Yet the whole revelation is in its final effect one of beauty, and essential nobility. As a friend and brother he is tender, unselfish, generous to a fault, impulsive and affectionate like a boy, yet capable of severe reserve when he thinks right, and wise with the wisdom that generally comes with ripe age, if it come at all. As a lover, who is wise? Keats's passion attacked him in the throes of his mortal illness. The letters to Fanny Brawne expose a sensitive nature wrought upon near to the utmost limit of suffering. The agonized confession of his weakness helps to an understanding of his strength. Apart from the

personal revelation, the letters form a literary autobiography of the highest possible value. Perhaps no poet ever educated himself more rapidly or more successfully. Without a grain of conceit, he knew he was to be a great poet. He laid himself open to the influence of Shakespeare, Milton, and Wordsworth, and let his own genius grow by "self-watchfulness." He freely released his sensitive, luxuriant imagination, yet applied to all his work the critical test of a keen-edged judgment. Keats has lately received hard knocks for concerning himself with philosophy whilst he was no philosopher, and for spoiling his poetry in consequence. But the letters seem to reveal a truth which we have often suspected, that there is such a thing as *thought*, as well as philosophy. The most memorable passages in these letters are radiating centres of thought—about poetry, the poet, human personality, human progress, and again the poet and his art. The exercise of this kind of thinking, now lively, now profound, always fruitful and illuminating, was as necessary a part of his self-education as his devoted study of his great predecessors. If he had not been capable of it, his poetry would have been poor and weak, where it is in the issue rich and strong. The best commentary upon Keats's poetry and the best interpretation of it is enclosed in this volume of his letters.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

Wordsworth's Anti-Climax. By W. L. SPERRY. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. x+228. \$2.50; 10s. 6d. net.

THERE could be no more convincing proof of the vitality and richness of Wordsworth's poetry than the diversity of commentary which it has inspired. So complex are the roots of this poetry, each one of them deep-penetrating, that it might seem, when we come to this commentary or that, as if each were dealing with a different poet. Most of this comment has its own portion of truth, for those who have dealt with Wordsworth's poetry have, for the most part, undertaken the labour of interpreting it out of a genuine vision of some aspect of its truth. But the book has not yet been written which has succeeded in expressing completely the unity in diversity of this poetry.

One of the results, in recent years, of this single-mindedness of critics in dealing with poetry that is essentially a complex unity

has been that both Wordsworth's life and Wordsworth's poetry have tended to be considered under the headings of "The Early Years" and "The Later Years," and as the earlier part of Wordsworth's life is richer in event than the later years, while most—although by no means all—of what is of the greatest value in his work was produced by 1815, the balance of this criticism leans overwhelmingly towards the early years. Yet there is a much more subtle interest both for the critic and for the biographer in the later years. It is part of the distinction of Dr. Edith Batho's admirable study, *The Later Wordsworth*, that it expresses, emphasizes, and brings home this interest, in addition to reasserting, in some passages of powerful and joyous polemic, the unity of Wordsworth's life and poetry. This study of the later Wordsworth has been followed recently by another, whose purpose is different. Dean Sperry's *Wordsworth's Anti-Climax* is an essay in the analysis of such factors in Wordsworth's life as have seemed to various critics to have some bearing on that lowering of poetic tension in most of Wordsworth's later poetry which it were idle to contest. This analysis, and the wide survey of Wordsworthian commentary and its tendencies which Dean Sperry gives in the course of it, would in themselves make the book a stimulating and relevant contribution to Wordsworthian criticism. Still more stimulating, although all of it is open to challenge, is the chapter, itself half a challenge to and half a complement of Professor Beattie's very valuable *Wordsworth's Doctrine and Art*, in which Dean Sperry puts forward his own suggestion as to the reason of Wordsworth's decline in poetic power.

Among the causes which have often been put forward as contributing to this decline Dean Sperry discusses—Wordsworth's defection from republicanism and later profession of Toryism and Anglicanism, the aftermath of the poet's love of Annette Vallon, the influence of hostile criticism, the premature exhaustion that followed the first great creative period; and he dismisses the claims that have been put forward for these as having been primary contributory factors to the diminution of Wordsworth's powers. Less convincing is his analysis of the extent to which the break with Coleridge was responsible for the decline of the creative faculty in Wordsworth. Contemporary testimony leaves us in no doubt at all as to the extraordinary gift Coleridge possessed of liberating the spirits of other men from the bondage in which they lay, even while he remained in bondage himself. Hazlitt's abandonment of acknow-

ledge was not Wordsworth's. Wordsworth would not have been Wordsworth if he could have cried aloud, of his first meeting with Coleridge, as Hazlitt did: "I was at that time dumb, inarticulate, helpless, like a worm by the way-side, crushed, bleeding, lifeless; . . . that my understanding . . . did not remain dumb and brutish, or at length found a language to express itself, I owe to Coleridge." Nor is there anywhere in his invocations to Coleridge, passionately tender though they be, the quality of passion that there is in Hazlitt's: "But oh thou! who didst lend me speech when I was dumb, to whom I owe it that I have not crept on my belly all the days of my life like the serpent . . .!" But he says hardly less, in his own more restrained way. In *The Prelude* he says of Coleridge practically what Carlyle said of Edward Irving: "But for him, I had never known what the communion of man with man means."

And Wordsworth's letters show that even during his creative years he felt, almost painfully, his own dependence on Coleridge for poetic stimulus.

If it is possible to point to any one circumstance as being primarily responsible for the lessening of Wordsworth's powers, it is to the breaking of this vital sympathy and this deep, close bond.

The solution offered by Dean Sperry is that Wordsworth was cramped, limited, and in the end obscured by the "system" of poetry he adopted, and particularly by his adoption of the Hartleian psychology. This chapter, interesting as it is, is not convincing. Too much is taken for granted as to Wordsworth's knowledge of Hartley previous to his meeting with Coleridge. There is nothing to show that Wordsworth had been deeply affected by Hartley's work, until it had been expounded to him by Coleridge. He then found that some of it coincided with and illuminated his own experience and helped him to rationalize his experience—but the fact that his indebtedness to Hartley succeeded instead of preceding the most vital experiences of his life, preserved him from any cramping dependence. The work of Hartley was but one of the many streams that went to feed his poetry.

And from the very beginning, his conception of the poet's task and of his own task far exceeded any suggestion that might have come to him from Hartley.

In his youth he planned almost as comprehensively as Milton had done.

The last chapter of the book, in which Dean Sperry touches in

less systematic manner than in the earlier chapters on this or that which he notes as symptomatic of the alteration in Wordsworth or as contributory to it, comes nearer the heart of the matter, and especially—for the impression remains obstinately that the decline of the poet followed some decline in the rectitude or harmony of the inner life of the man—the penetrating comment made on Wordsworth's relationship to his friends "that he seems to have used them rather than enjoyed them."

CATHERINE M. MACLEAN.

Bernard Shaw's Phonetics. By J. SAXE. Copenhagen : Levin & Munkgaard ; London : Allen & Unwin. 1936. Pp. 86. 6s. net.

IT is often asserted by philologists that most of the characteristics of present-day Cockney have developed since the middle of the nineteenth century. Höfer even argued that the Cockneys of Dickens's time would hardly have understood Cockneys of the 'nineties. Mr. Saxe's monograph examines this point of view by comparing the Cockney used in *Punch* (1850-60) with that used by Shaw. By a mathematical type of collation he finds that "the bulk of the material" is common to *Punch* and Shaw, and concludes that "the great gulf alleged to subsist between genuine Cockney in the two periods may, with some allowances, easily be bridged." The argument is open to the objection that most of the pronunciations which modern Cockney shares with early Victorian Cockney are by no means characteristic of the dialect, and are merely vulgarisms which are shared by many non-Standard forms of English. The peculiar vowels and diphthongs and the frequency of the glottal stop which are the dominant features of present-day Cockney hardly appear at all in early Victorian Cockney.

There is more to object to in Mr. Saxe's book than the conclusion, however. It is an incompetent and even careless piece of work—the numerous printer's errors are symptomatic. Mr. Saxe usually takes Shaw's "phonetic spellings" quite literally, and gravely analyses a Cockney pronunciation which nobody has ever heard. He appears to have no practical acquaintance with the dialect, and accordingly fails to appreciate Shaw's exaggerations or the imperfect approximations caused by Shaw's use of the ordinary alphabet instead of a phonetic alphabet. He occasionally questions Shaw's transcriptions, and is thereby led into absurdities. He doubts, for example, whether Cockneys use an [r] in *I sor a, jawring and drorin'*

room. The abundance of Mr. Saxe's inaccuracies in his handling of modern Cockney suggests that it would have been better had he analysed the speech of some of the thousands of Cockneys who are of Mr. Shaw's age.

The handling of the earlier type of Cockney is almost as incompetent. Mr. Saxe appears to know nothing of the history of the vulgar speech of London. When he suggests the history of pronunciations he is consequently led into such unsupported theories as "the complicated process [by which just, such, touch, much became jist, jest, sech, tech, mech] shows the following stages of modification [$\Lambda < \text{æ} < \text{e}(\text{i})$]." In cold truth, *sech* and *mech* were used in London speech before [Λ] had developed at all in English. Above all, he shows no understanding of the fact that practically all the Cockneyisms in *Punch* were used by good speakers in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and that they became vulgar only with the development of an absolute standard of pronunciation.

WILLIAM MATTHEWS.

SHORT NOTICE

The Appreciation of Poetry. P. GURREY. London: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. 120. 3s. 6d.

Dr. Gurrey is a lecturer at the Institute of Education and his interest in poetry is primarily pedagogic. The subject of his sensible and well-informed study is not so much the appreciation of poetry, as the words are ordinarily understood, as the *teaching* of an appreciation of poetry. The analyses of poetic Thought, Subsidiary Meanings, Imagery, Emotion, Sound, Rhythm, and Form, which take up seven of his twelve chapters, are all practical in their intention. They are so many sticks with which to beat the dog of existing methods of poetry-teaching.

Dr. Gurrey's case is certainly a good one. His charge against most teachers, and all recent manuals, of poetry can be summarized into three counts. The first is that there is a conspiracy to-day to pretend that the appreciation of poetry is easy. (He quotes the Headmaster of Rugby, "Poetry is really a very simple thing, simpler than prose, very often much simpler than life itself.") The second is the common delusion that the words of the poetry don't matter; actually, as Dr. Gurrey shows, "the basis of our love of poetry is a delight in words." And the third, and most iniquitous, is the still prevalent assumption that a lesson in grammar or prosody, illustrated by examples from poems, is the same thing as a lesson in poetry. "It seems that figures of speech are still the prey of the amateur collector, and may be lifted from their contexts, explained, named and docketed without anyone's incurring a condemnation of the practice." In point of fact, of course, a knowledge of figures of speech and rhyme-schemes, in the abstract, has nothing whatever to do with either the enjoyment or the understanding of poetry.

These points were well worth making, but they are negative rather than positive. Dr. Gurrey has evaded the crucial problem. For, granted that the reading of poetry-manuals and the attendance of poetry-classes are an utter waste of time, what are we to substitute for them? What we require is a new point of view, a new technique; and it is here that Dr. Gurrey fails us. Admirable in attack, he is vague and half-hearted in his constructive proposals.

F. W. B.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

AMERICAN SPEECH, Vol. XI., October 1936—

The Phonemic Structure of English Monosyllables (Kemp Malone), pp. 205-18.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, MANCHESTER, Vol. 20, July-August 1936—

Desiderius Erasmus (H. Guppy), pp. 245-57.

William Tindale: Scholar and Martyr (H. Guppy), pp. 258-67.

Further Letters of the Johnson Circle (J. L. Clifford), pp. 268-85.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, Vol. 154, August 1936—

Joseph Conrad—Twelve Years After (Richard Colenutt), pp. 129-40.

ELH, Vol. 3, June 1936—

The Parable of the Good Shepherd, *De Contemptu Mundi*, and *Lycidas*: Excerpts for a Chapter on Literary History and Culture (G. R. Coffman), pp. 101-13.

The Stella of Astrophel (W. G. Friedrich), pp. 114-39.

Re-examination of the evidence.

The Dramatic Use of Hobbes's Political Ideas (L. Teeter), pp. 140-69.

Chaucer and Jean de Meun: *De Consolatione Philosophie* (J. M. Cline), pp. 170-81.

Jean de Meun's theory of translation.

— September —

Thomas Percy's Unfinished Collection, *Ancient English and Scottish Poems* (V. H. Ogburn), pp. 183-89.

Spenser's *Twelve Aeglogues Proportionable to the Twelve Monethes* (Mary Parmenter), pp. 190-217.

Spenser's primary purpose.

A French Review of Tennyson's 1830 and 1832 Volumes (C. L. Carlson), pp. 218-20.

In *L'Europe Littéraire*, 1833.

The Happy Ending of *Adam Bede* (J. S. Diekhoff), pp. 221-27.

Isolable Lyrics of the Mystery Plays (L. E. Pearson), pp. 228-52

Mæðhild (Kemp Malone), pp. 253-56.

Deor, ll. 14-17: Scandinavian ballad versions of the story.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 119

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Band 71, Heft 1, August 1936—

An Essay in Blue (A. E. H. Swaen), pp. 1-13.

Metaphorical senses.

Zur Schreibung der interdentalen Spirans im Mittelenglischen
(Magda Freiin von Appel), pp. 14-26.

Thomas More der Heitere (Friedrich Brie), pp. 27-57.

Daniels *Cleopatra* und Shakespeare (Johannes Schütze), pp. 58-72.

Die konjunktionale Verwendung von substantivischen Wortgruppen
mit oder ohne *that* im neueren Englisch (Johann Ellinger),
pp. 73-82.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XVIII., October 1936—

The Antagonism of Forms in the Eighteenth Century (II) (B. Fehr),
pp. 193-205.

The Verbs with Direct and Indirect Object Re-Examined (II)
(G. Kirchner), pp. 206-22.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Band 170,
Heft 1, 2, October 1936—

Beiträge zur Textkritik von Lord Berners' Froissart-Übersetzung
(G. Schleich), pp. 20-43.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (Johannes Speck), pp. 44-67.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXV., July
1936—

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight (Elizabeth M. Wright), pp. 313-20.
Further textual notes.

Sex and Gender in the Lindisfarne Gospels (A. S. C. Ross), pp. 321-30.

David Hartley in *The Ancient Mariner* (Dorothy Waples), pp. 337-51.

The Preterite and the Perfect Tense in Present-Day English
(W. F. Bryan), pp. 363-82.

Germanic Notes (A. M. Sturtevant), pp. 389-400.

On various phonological changes in North and West Germanic.

The First Edition of Milton's *History of Britain* (Harris Fletcher),
pp. 405-14.

Textual errors in the Columbia edition; states of the first edition; the
text; the portrait and current prices.

October—

Form and/or Function in Grammar (Otto Jespersen), pp. 461-65.

The Antiquity of the Germanic Verb-Adverb Locution (Murat H.
Roberts), pp. 466-81.

"Lay" and "Law" (Harold B. Allen), pp. 496-99.

Evidence of use in thieves' cant.

William Mason and Sir William Chambers' *Dissertation on Oriental
Gardening* (Isabel W. Chase), pp. 517-29.

Alastor: The Spirit of Solitude (Arthur E. DuBois), pp. 530-45.

LIBRARY, Vol. XVII., September 1936—

Archdeacon Francis Wrangham (1769-1842) and his Books (M. Sadleir), pp. 129-30.

Joseph Pote of Eton and Bartlet's Farriery (R. A. Austen-Leigh), pp. 131-54.

Three Notes on Caxton (C. F. Bühler), pp. 155-66.

Date of printing of *Boethius*; the *Book callid Caton*; Lydgate's *Life of our Lady*.

Some Contemporary Accounts of Renaissance Printing Methods (D. C. Allen), pp. 167-71.

King Lear—Mislineation and Stenography (W. W. Greg), pp. 172-83.

Three Unrecorded English Books of the Sixteenth Century (F. C. Francis), pp. 184-99.

Opuscles . . . of saynt bonauëture . . . put in to Englyshe by . . . Rycharde whytforde, c. 1523-30; *The Pomander of prayer*, 1528; *the doctrynnall of symple people*, c. 1515.

Variants in the 1746 Edition of Thomson's *Seasons* (J. E. Wells), pp. 214-20.

A Presentation Copy of Coleridge's *Sibylline Leaves*, with Manuscript Notes, Altered Readings, and Deletions by the Author (N. van Patten), pp. 221-24.

Shakespeare and the Reporters (H. T. Price), pp. 225-27.

Criticism of article in April, 1935; reply by W. Matthews, pp. 227-30.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XXXIV., August 1936—

Pater and Moore (Seán O'Faoláin), pp. 330-38.

— September —

Henry James and R. L. Stevenson (Janet Adam Smith), pp. 412-20.

MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. V., June 1936—

Alexander and the Earthly Paradise in Mediæval English (M. M. Lascelles), pp. 79-104.

Concluded October, pp. 173-88.

MS. Cotton Galba A. XIX: *The Proverbs of Alfred* (N. R. Ker), pp. 115-20.

Text as decipherable on three leaves which survived the Cottonian fire.

A Postscript to "Late Old English Rune-Names" (*M.Æ.* I. 24-34) (C. E. Wright), pp. 149-51.

Note on MS. Cotton Domitian A. IX.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LI., November 1936—

Notes on a Shakespearean First Folio in Padua (L. F. Casson), pp. 417-23.

Late seventeenth-century actors' copy?

The Composition of "Scots Wha Hae" (R. T. Fitzhugh), pp. 423-26.

Syme's manuscript account of his tour with Burns, and Currie's editing.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 121

The Middle Scotch Poem on Heraldry in Queen's College MS. 161
(R. H. Bowers), pp. 429-31.

Variants from text in Harleian 6149 edited by Furnivall.

Cæsar and Virgil's Magic in England (G. L. Frost), pp. 431-33.

Story in Nicholas Trivet's Chronicle.

A Textual Note on Chaucer: *Gentillesse*, 20 (R. E. Brittain), pp. 433-35.

A Chaucer Allusion in a 1644 Pamphlet (P. B. Mitchell), pp. 435-37.

In Thomas Jordan's *The Debtors Apologie*.

An Allusion to Chaucer in the Seventeenth Century (P. B. Mitchell), p. 437.

In *Mercurius Britannicus*, no. 103.

A Letter of Christina Rossetti (M. E. Curti), pp. 439-40.

To Elihu Burritt, in 1867.

Shenstone's Birthplace (M. M. Ward), pp. 440-41.

Explanation of error in Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses*.

Two Swift Imitations (C. M. Webster), p. 441.

Books noticed in the *Critical Review* in 1761 and 1791.

"Weiblichkeit" = "Womanhood" (W. Kurrelmeyer), pp. 443-45.

Wieland's borrowing from Shakespeare.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXI., October 1936—

Heaven and Earth in the *Parlement of Foules* (R. C. Goffin), pp. 493-99.

The First English Translation of the *Decameron* (H. G. Wright), pp. 500-12.

"Miching Malicho" and the Play Scene in *Hamlet* (Alice Walker), pp. 413-17.

Reference to Malichus, the poisoner of Antipater; "inexplicability" of the dumb-show.

A Suggested Solution of Riddle 61 (B. Colgrave and B. M. Griffiths), pp. 545-47.

The kelp-weed.

Widsith: Addenda and Corrigenda (Kemp Malone), pp. 547-49.

A Note on a Hitherto Unprinted Speech by Andrew Marvell (Caroline Robbins), pp. 549-50.

In the House of Commons, October 14, 1667.

Some English Translations of Seventeenth-century Spanish Novels (J. A. Bourne), pp. 555-56.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIV., August 1936—

Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity (Richard McKeon), pp. 1-35.

Its bearing on modern criticism.

English in Manorial Documents of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries (J. R. Hulbert), pp. 37-61.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. 22, Part 1, October 1936—

The Infinitive after *to dare* (G. Mulder), pp. 25-48.

NINETEENTH CENTURY, Vol. CXX., October 1936—

William Tyndale (R. S. T. Haslehurst), pp. 475-81.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 171, August 1, 1936—

The Wooden Legs in Dickens (V. R.), pp. 74-77.

Note by G. Crosse, August 22, p. 139; by A. W. F., October 3, pp. 246-47.

Alcuin's Visit to Wearmouth (R. B. Hepple), pp. 82-83.

— August 8—

Chapman's Greek (G. G. L.), p. 94.

Example of mistranslation.

Chaucer, John Lyly, and *Sphaera Civitatis* (1588) (D. T. Starnes), p. 95.

Reference to Chaucer, and Latin poem by Lyly.

Floiter (L. R. M. Strachan), pp. 100-01.

Uses of word, and dialectal variants; note by F. Williamson, October 3, p. 247, and October 17, pp. 282-83.

— August 15—

Congreve's Will and Personal Papers (John C. Hodges), p. 117.

— August 29—

The Notes on Farnaby ascribed to John Milton (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 152-54.

Marginalia in Farnaby's Latin Grammar now in Harvard College Library.

Becky Sharp: Her Original (Senex), p. 157.

Sydney, Lady Morgan? Replies by J. F. M. and J. Seton-Anderson, September 12, p. 197.

— September 5—

Matthew Arnold: Prose Quotations (T. C. C.), pp. 169-71.

— September 12—

The Name Shakespeare (C. L'Estrange Ewen), pp. 187-88.

Origin and early occurrences. Note by A. Welby, September 26, pp. 230-31; by C. L'Estrange Ewen, October 17, pp. 281-82.

— September 19—

A Third Thousand Notes on *N.E.D.* (*M III*) (G. G. Loane), pp. 202-05.

Earlier examples, and words and senses not given. Continued October 3, pp. 236-39; October 17, pp. 273-75.

— September 26—

Chesterfield and Dowdeswell: Letters (F. W. Cock), pp. 219-21.

October 18 and 25, 1755.

"How goes the enemy?" (H. W. Crundell), p. 223.

In *The Dramatist*, acted 1789.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 123

Anticipations of Tennyson (Hibernicus), p. 223.

Ramsay's *Gentle Shepherd*: An Association Volume (J. L. Weir), pp. 224-25.

With letters by C. K. Sharpe and Braidwood.

Chatterton set to Music (G. W. Wright), pp. 228-29.

Wordsworth Tablet and the Celandine (V. R.), pp. 241-42.

Wrong flower represented.

Early Fielding Documents (W. W. Gill), pp. 242.

Attempted abduction of heiress in 1725.

NOTES AND QUERIES, October 10—

The Word "Buttercup": New Research (V. R.), pp. 254-55.

Fynes Moryson, Giordano Bruno and William Shakespeare (J. C. Whitebrook), pp. 255-60.

Queries from Chapman's *Iliad* (G. G. L.), pp. 261-62.

October 17—

From a Collection of Autographs: VII. William Bray, F.S.A. (T. Cann Hughes), pp. 272-73.

Letter referring to Evelyn, his library and his diary.

A Tribute to Henry Kirke White in 1824 (Olybrius), p. 277.

In *The Rhode Island American*, May 25.

October 24—

Carlyle and Fraser's "Letter on the Doctrine of St. Simon" (Hill Shine), pp. 291-93.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XV., July 1936—

Daniel Defoe: An Artist in the Puritan Tradition (R. G. Stamm), pp. 225-46.

Donne's *Extasie*, Contra Legouis (G. R. Potter), pp. 247-53.

Refutation of Legouis' interpretation.

Richard Whitlock, Learning's Apologist (G. Williamson), pp. 254-72.

Splendor out of Scandal: The Lucinda-Artesia Papers in *The Female Tatler* (P. B. Anderson), pp. 286-300.

Shall a King Smite a King? (S. A. Tannenbaum), pp. 307-10.

"The sledged Polack," *Hamlet*, I. i. 62-4.

The Earliest Recorded English Wellerism (B. J. Whiting), pp. 310-11.

In Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

The Imperial Tragedy (W. H. McCabe), pp. 311-14.

Author and source.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. LI., September 1936—

Chaucer's Prioress' Tale: An Early Analogue (Albert C. Friend), pp. 621-25.

In a thirteenth-century MS. at Oxford.

- A Reinterpretation of Surrey's Character and Actions (Edwin R. Casady), pp. 626-35.
- A Tentative Chronology of Marlowe's and Some Other Elizabethan Plays (Rupert Taylor), pp. 643-88.
- Plot Structure in Peele's Plays as a Test of Authorship (Arthur M. Sampley), pp. 689-701.
- Text Sources of the Folio and Quarto *Henry VI* (Lucille King), pp. 702-18.
- Closeness to Hall and Holinshed as test of priority.
- Nature and Shakespeare (Edgar C. Knowlton), pp. 719-44.
- Milton and Manso: Cups or Books (Michele De Filippis), pp. 745-56.
- Epitaphium Damonis*, ll. 181-97.
- The Punctuation of *Comus* (John S. Diekhoff), pp. 757-68.
- Crashaw's Reputation in the Nineteenth Century (Austin Warren), pp. 769-85.
- The Dates of Two Dryden Plays (Charles E. Ward), pp. 786-92.
- Marriage à la Mode* and *Amboyna*.
- Three Unnoticed Writings of Swift (William Van Lennep), pp. 793-802.
- In *The Monthly Mirror*: Text and evidence of authenticity.
- The Time-Scheme of *Tristram Shandy* and a Source (Theodore Baird), pp. 803-20.
- The Analysis of Literary Situation (Carl E. W. L. Dahlström), pp. 872-89.
- REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. XIII., August 1936—
- Samuel Richardson et le Roman épistolaire (P. Dottin), pp. 481-99.
- The Continuations of *Pamela* (F. G. Black), pp. 499-507.
- REVUE DE LITTÉRATURE COMPARÉE, Vol. 16, October-December 1936—
- A French Influence on T. S. Eliot: Remy de Gourmont (G. Rees), pp. 764-67.
- SPECULUM, Vol. XI, July 1936 —
- A Discovery in *John de Mandevilles* (K. W. Cameron), pp. 351-59.
- List of bearers of the name, 1129-1479.
- STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIII., October 1936—
- Burton's Influence on Ford's *The Lover's Melancholy* (G. F. Sensabaugh), pp. 545-71.
- Eighteenth Century Correspondence: A Survey (R. P. Bond), pp. 572-86.
- Falsetto in Shelley (M. Eunice Monsel), pp. 587-609.
- Browning's Heresies (C. R. Tracy), pp. 610-25.
- Robert Browning, Dramatist (A. E. DuBois), pp. 626-55.
- Ferrara and *My Last Duchess* (L. S. Friedland), pp. 656-84.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, August 1, 1936—

A Poet of Two Worlds : The Imagery of Mr. de la Mare, pp. 621-22.

Discord at Little Gidding (Bernard Blackstone), p. 628.

Letters relating to disputes between Bathsheba Ferrars and the family.

— August 8—

Scott's Journal (H. J. C. Grierson), p. 648.

Need for a new edition.

Cunninghame Graham and Hudson (R. Gordon Wasson), p. 648.

Notes on Mr. Morley Roberts' letter in *T.L.S.*, April 11.

Erasmus in England (H. W. D.), p. 648.

Works printed in England.

— August 15—

Dr. Johnson and Nature : English Poets in the Highlands, pp. 653-54.

Scenery between Shakespeare and Dryden (Allardyce Nicoll), p. 658.

Designs recorded in the manuscript of *Candy Restored*.

A Paper by George Herbert (Bernard Blackstone), p. 664.

"Reasons for Arth. Woodnoth's Liuing wth S^r Jhon Danuers." Note by F. E. Hutchinson, August 22, p. 680.

The Wild Irish Girl (W. Roberts), p. 664.

Letter from Sir T. Lawrence to Miss Owenson, December 1810.

William Congreve : confused signatures (John C. Hodges), p. 664.

Similarity between signatures of the dramatist and his cousin.

— August 22—

Scott's 1814 Diary (Davidson Cook), p. 680.

Lockhart's editing.

Sir Thomas Gravener (D. T. Starnes), p. 680.

Who was the subject of Wyatt's epitaph?

Verses on Blenheim (P. V. Thompson), p. 680.

Probable date of verses ascribed to Swift.

The Western Vindicator (John Warner), p. 680.

Wordsworth and Coleridge : Early Appreciation in the North

(A. N. L. Munby), p. 684.

Evidence of anthologies. Reply by B. G. Brooks, August 29, p. 700.

— August 29—

The Two-Handed Engine (A. F. Pollard), p. 697.

Apocalyptic imagery?

John Scott and "Maga" (A. L. Strout), p. 697.

Origin of the quarrel.

Donne and "the Queen" (R. E. Bennett), p. 697.

Note on Donne's letter of July 17, 1613.

Shelley—Leigh Hunt (Marcel Kessel), p. 697.

Poems by Shelley in the *Examiner*.

A Textual Error in Pater (G. B. A. Fletcher), p. 697.

"Sea-wind" for "sea-weed," in *Greek Studies*.

Actors in Bristol, 1741-1748 (Sybil Rosenfeld), p. 700.

Account book of the Jacob's Wells Theatre.

Two Emendations (R. F. Patterson), p. 700.

In *Ivanhoe*, ch. xix, and *A Voyage to Laputa*.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, September 5—

Shakespeare's Imagery, pp. 701-2.

Whiter's anticipation of modern methods. Note by J. Isaacs, September 12, p. 729.

The Harvard Shelley Note books (Marcel Kessel), p. 713.

Errors in Professor Woodberry's identification of the hands of Shelley and Mrs. Shelley. Note by Helen Darbishire, September 12, p. 729.

Lear's *Book of Nonsense* (G. L. Butler), p. 713.

Bibliographical notes on the first editions.

— September 12—

Dekker and Jonson (Fredson T. Bowers), p. 729.

Reference in *Satiro-Mastix* to Jonson as actor.

"Pleris cum Musco" (H. L. R. Edwards), p. 729.

Skelton's *Speak, Parrot*, l. 190: *pleris* for *peeris*? Replies by G. P. C. Sutton and E. A. Bunyard, September 19, p. 748; by Phyllis Abrahams, October 3, p. 791.

A Spanish Proverb (E. G. Mathews), p. 729.

Source of proverb quoted by Donne. Note, giving correction of date, September 26, p. 768.

— September 19—

Pope's Lost Prologue (N. Ault), p. 742.

To Rowe's *Tragedy of the Lady Jane Gray*: text and evidence of identification.

Henry Glapthorne (J. H. Walter), p. 748.

Biographical note.

Charlotte Brontë's "Bretton" (J. Malham-Dembleby), p. 748.

Name suggested by John Britton's *History of York Cathedral*?

The Holinshed Family (Clarence Brownfield), p. 748.

Biographical details.

Jane Austen (R. W. Chapman), p. 748.

Explanation of reference in letter of June 15, 1808; note on Darcy's family.

M. le Texier: Reader of Plays (W. Roberts), p. 752.

— September 26—

Prince Fortinbras (J. Dover Wilson), p. 768.

Disputing the validity of the parallel adduced by Mr. J. P. Malleeson. Reply by H. W. Crundell, October 3, p. 791; by J. P. Malleeson, October 10, p. 815; rejoinder by J. Dover Wilson, October 17, p. 839; by A. Gomme, October 31, p. 887.

Letters of Linacre (R. Weiss), p. 768.

Letter to Pietro Machiavelli.

"Scrape" in *Sir Gawain* (Henry L. Savage), p. 768.

In l. 1571, of the boar *sharpening* his tusks. Note correcting misprint, October 31, p. 887.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 127

- Thomas Bastard (S. H. Atkins), p. 768.
 Inventory of his goods at his death.
 Goldsmith to Sir William Chambers (R. W. Seitz), p. 772.
 Text of letter and note of 1773.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, October 3—

- Tyndale and our Bible : The English Prose Tradition, pp. 773-74.
 Surrey's Vocabulary (M. M. Gray), p. 791.
 His debt to Gavin Douglas. Further notes by Edith Bannister, October 24,
 p. 863 ; by M. M. Gray, October 31, p. 887.
 Hoskins's *Directions* (B. M. Wagner), p. 791.
 Variants in a second MS. in the Bodleian.
 Thomson's [?] *A Poem to the Memory of Mr. Congreve* (J. E. Wells),
 p. 791.
 Misprint in large paper edition as evidence of priority ; note by Mr. Iolo
 Williams.
 "Perftaunt" (W. R. Dunstan), p. 791.
 Note on *Love's Labour's Lost*, v. ii. 67. Note by H. Cunningham, October
 10, p. 815 ; reply by W. R. Dunstan, October 17, p. 839 ; by J. Dover
 Wilson, October 24, p. 283 ; by W. R. Dunstan, October 31, p. 887.

— October 10—

- A Poem by Dryden ? (W. G. Hiscock), p. 815.
 Further evidence of authorship of *The Triumphs of Levy*.
 The Date of Thomas Shadwell's Birth (Brice Harris), p. 815.
 Gadbury's evidence for March 24, 1640/1 ; reply by D. M. Walmsley,
 October 17, p. 839.
 Sir Henry Lee (E. St. John Brooks), p. 815.
 Origin of family name.
 Machiavelli's *Discourses* : A Manuscript Translation of 1599
 (G. N. Giordano-Orsini), p. 820.
 Further note, October 17, p. 844 ; note by W. Roberts, October 24, p. 863.

— October 17—

- A Keats Letter (Keith Glenn), p. 839.
 Evidence of date 1816 for the earliest letter to Cowden Clark.
 Lockhart's *Valerius* (A. L. Strout), p. 839.
 Alterations in second edition.
 A *Journal from Parnassus* : An Unpublished Satire on Dryden
 (Hugh Macdonald), p. 844.

— October 24—

- The Phoenix and Turtle : Was Lady Bedford the Phoenix ?
 (B. H. Newdigate), p. 862.
 The Princess of Parma (W. van Lennep), p. 863.
 Date of performance ; notes on *The Election*.
 The *Ancren Riwle* (H. E. Allen), p. 863.
 Discovery of another French version.

" Hermoniake " (H. L. R. Edwards), p. 863.

Skelton's *Colin Clout*, l. 299.

Milton's Library (K. W. Cameron), p. 868.

Collection of eleven tracts with his autograph.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, October 31—

Spenser and Stanyhurst (R. Gottfried), p. 887.

Unfairness of Spenser's attack in the *View of the Present State of Ireland*

Bernard's Catalogue (J. A. W. Bennett), p. 887.

The translator of Wanley's English Preface.

Beckford and *Al Raoui* (Guy Chapman), p. 887.

Evidence against Beckford's authorship.

Lines to Clare (Sylva Norman), p. 887.

By Charles S. Middleton, in 1848.

Housman and Headlam (G. L. Richmond), p. 887.

Four line verse inscription in presentation copy of Manilius, Book 1

Cancels in Percy's *Reliques* (A. N. L. Munby), p. 892.

